DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 843 RC 005 268

TITLE	Instructional Improvement in Middle and Junior High Grades for 250 Teachers of Disadvantaged Students in Ten Rural, Isolated, Majority Negro, Georgia School Districts. Director's Report.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-204828-2293-725
NOTE	128p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Biracial Schools, Culturally Disadvantaged, Curriculum Development, *Disadvantaged Schools, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Negroes, Program Development, *Rural Education, Self Concept, *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Georgia

ABSTRACT

Utilizing summer conferences, seminar activities, and bi-weekly contact with a member of the University of Georgia staff, this project sought improvement for teachers of disadvantaged students. Some 120 teachers in 10 local school systems received personal, concerned, and professional assistance for 1 full year. The teacher population was drawn from rural, isolated majority-Negro school systems in Georgia. The most important contributions of this project resulted from efforts (1) to introduce, and guide implementation of, more appropriate instructional methods in classrooms; (2) to review and update individual teachers in their content areas; and (3) to change self attitudes. Five formal evaluative devices were used: Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Measures of Attitudes (semantic differential), Objectives of Programs for the Disadvantaged (ranking), and Program Practices for Disadvantaged Children (priority rating of 24 program practices). Results from the first of these devices suggest that the teachers served gained positive attitudes about themselves. The major strength of the project lay in its conduct in the field rather than under laboratory conditions. Approximately 110 pages of appendices provide papers presented at the National Conference for Supervision and Curriculum Development, formal evaluation devices used in the project, and other project-related materials. (MJB)

ED050843

Director's Report

to the

Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
Division of Schools
United States Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Grant Number OEG-0-9-204828-2293-725

Project Number 204828

RECEIVED
MAY 10 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN MIDDLE AND JUNIOR HIGH GRADES FOR 250 TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN TEN RURAL, ISOLATED, MAJORITY NEGRO, GEORGIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

(Instructional Improvement for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students)

1/14/69 to 7/31/70
(Beginning Date) (Ending Date)

Director: Ray E. Bruce, Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Supervision
College of Education
405 Baldwin Hall

Host Institution: University of Georgia

Location: Athens, Georgia 30601

Director's Telephone: 404-542-1343

Date of Report: August 31, 1970

RC005268

I. Introduction

This project was initially designed to present opportunities for teachers to increase their competencies so that they could:

(a) evidence greater knowledge of, and more effective teaching strategies within, their subject matter areas.

(b) examine the school program of the middle and junior high years for its relevance to disadvantaged children and potential drop-outs and make recommendations concerning that program.

(c) analyze in a biracial setting the problems faced by faculty members in school systems committed to elimination of the dual school system and design strategies for meeting those problems.

The project addressed a fundamental educational need of most rural, majority Negro school systems that lack proper financing and adequate supervisory staff: the need to increase the competencies of teachers for teaching disadvantaged students and for functioning professionally in a totally desegregated school system.

II. Operation of the Program

1. Planning

This project grew out of a summer 1968 pilot institute funded by Title XI, NDEA, and commissioned by an ad hoc committee within the Office of Education called the Rural Isolated Task Force. The chairman of that committee was Mr. Richard L. Fairley; the activities of his committee were identified as elements of the Rural Isolated Project.

As part of the Rural Isolated Project two institutes were conducted on the campus of the University of Georgia during the summer of 1968. A six-week institute for teachers and administrators served participants from six school systems, two each in Mississippi, South Carolina, and Georgia. A two-week institute was planned for superintendents and/or their representatives from 17 southern and border states.

The two 1968 institutes convinced some University of Georgia faculty members of the need to bring some measure of help to teachers of the disadvantaged in rural areas. Contacts with school systems in Georgia during the summer of 1968 and in the follow-up period during the 1968-69 academic year helped identify likely participant districts for the 1969-70 effort. Most significantly, perhaps, the 1968 experience convinced interested faculty members at the University of Georgia that the impact of college teachers on public school teachers would be much greater in the field than on the college campus.

Early in 1969 the decision was made to conduct three five-day drive-in conferences during the summer, each with essentially the same format and content. These conferences were designed to review contemporary challenges in instructional improvement and to give each school system group the opportunity to define a particular topic for year-long exploration and improvement. Each one-week summer conference was planned as an orientation period and problem identification experience for the year-long project. During the 1969-70 school year following the summer conferences, each of the participating systems received 18 full days of service including both classroom consultation and seminar activities. A faculty member was assigned to each system in September; he then worked with that same school system throughout the year.

Planning for this project was aided and support was made possible because of the continued identification with the Rural Isolated Task Force. Within the Office of Education authorization was generated for ten colleges to engage in some kind of support activities for southern school systems that were rural, isolated, and majority black. Two conferences, one in Washington and one in Atlanta, were held during the 1968-69 school year so that prospective directors could share ideas for institutes. Advice was sought by the Georgia team from State Department of Education officials concerning possible school system participants and the possibility of Title I, ESEA, stipend support for individual teacher participants. Many individuals within the College of Education were consulted, particularly from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and the Center for Educational Improvement which is funded by Title IV of the Civil Rights Act.

As a result of the use of these consulting resources many program elements were strengthened. Only one major change in plans grew out of the many conferences; the hope of winning Title I, ESEA, stipend support for teacher participants was abandoned. The entire project was replanned with no consideration of payment of stipends to participants. The grant figure did not include stipends, and the problems associated with Title I involvement seemed too complex for resolution in time to be of value to this project.

From the beginning the Rural Isolated Task Force relied on multiple sources for funding its activities. The invitation to the University of Georgia indicated this dependence and quoted a figure from EPDA which was honored and even increased at a later date. Even at the increased level of funding, however, the only expenditure from the grant during the planning period was for secretarial help. The remainder of the EPDA grant was needed during the period of operation. Other expenses associated with planning were borne by the College of Education, University of Georgia.

In fairness to the host institution anticipating future projects under multiple funding arrangements a firmer commitment for adequate funding for each phase of the project should be documented. The concept of multiple funding is most attractive and the director of this project endorses it fully. In the final analysis, however, apart from the host institution only EPDA delivered on its commitments to this project. All proposed funding sources need to be carefully identified and the amount of funding from each committed before planning begins. In our institution, with the funding secure, other necessities for planning--time, staff, and facilities--can be quickly mobilized.

2. Participants

This project was designed to serve 250 teachers of disadvantaged students in ten rural, isolated, majority Negro, Georgia school districts. Recruiting of school systems was difficult in Georgia during the spring of 1969 because of increasing tension regarding court-ordered desegregation and the associated hurried development of private schools in many of the counties where we hoped to work. We were able to enlist teachers from ten school systems, but we fell far short of the 250 we had hoped to serve on a continuing basis. Only 120 completed the Participant Data Form (OE 7214) which reached us after mid-year. Only these 120 considered themselves active, full-time participants in the year-long project. An additional 29 were infrequent participants in the biweekly, two-hour, after-school seminars conducted in their school districts. More than 100 additional professionals in these systems were reached at least once by the project staff through conferences, classroom visits, demonstration teaching, faculty meetings in which staff members made presentations, and through regular conferences with central office personnel.

No stipends were available for participants from the project budget. School systems had to be recruited without this inducement and then teachers within those systems had to be recruited without benefit of stipend. After repeated efforts among the superintendents of rural, isolated, majority Negro, Georgia school systems eight indicated a desire to participate. The superintendent of a ninth school system which was just less than majority Negro was eager to involve his school system in the project; he was allowed to do so when the roster was still unfilled in late May, 1969. From a tenth system where there was reluctance to commit the full system to the project came a single teacher who had gained permission from her superintendent to request to be associated with an adjoining participating school system for the seminars. In the absence of any other requests hers was accepted by the project staff, and her system completed the roster of ten.

The project had hoped to serve in each of the ten systems 25 teachers from the middle and junior high grades. The criterion of grade assignment was ignored when system, and then teacher, commitments were found to be so difficult to obtain. The very small size of total faculties in participating systems (as low as 36 total faculty members) and the absence of the stipend as an inducement to individual participants caused the project staff to open the program to anyone who would give his time. Elements of the "purpose of the project" were necessarily altered as the expanded range of participants covered the twelve grades.

In the face of recruitment difficulties the biracial requirement was also relaxed for individual participating school systems. Each of the three one-week summer conferences was biracial, but two of the eight systems with more than one teacher participant were able to recruit only Negro participants. Of the total of 120 officially recorded participants (Participant Data Form, OE 7214) 80 were Negro and 40 were white.

There were eight fully participating school systems. In each of these there were 18 regular biweekly seminar sessions, each of which followed a full school day of conference, visitation, and demonstration teaching by project staff members. From one county there was commitment by one teacher only with permission of the superintendent; that teacher associated herself with an adjoining participating system for seminars and received only one visit in her school. In one other county there was early and complete cooperation by the superintendent, but he was able to recruit only one teacher participant. The staff honored its early commitment to that system even though there was the single participant by serving regularly that teacher and other faculty members in her school throughout the year; the formally enrolled teacher participant there traveled to an adjoining participanting system to participate in 18 seminar sessions.

3. Staff

The staff for the three one-week summer conferences consisted of four full-time faculty members and three doctoral candidates from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, University of Georgia. Each person was chosen because of his potential for a unique contribution during the summer conference. Participating school system teams had one-week of contact with the entire project staff so that the most effective pairings of faculty members and school systems for the school-year program could be made.

With the beginning of the school year the services of one faculty member were no longer available to the project by reason of that member's assumption of the responsibilities of department chairman. Another doctoral candidate was recruited for the project team.

Plans for the summer conferences and the year-long program were developed during a series of staff conferences in the late spring of 1969. Each staff member--faculty member and doctoral candidate--was recruited because of his particular array of skills. Each made his contribution to the planning and implementation based on his shared and unique expertise. The spring conferences were successful in developing team unity and respect for individual contributions; these attitudes carried throughout the project. Conferences held irregularly during the year helped maintain the integrity of the team even though each member of the project staff was working only with systems assigned to him following the summer conferences.

The assignment of a staff member to a particular system for the year was a total staff decision. The assignment was suggested by the reaction of a school system team during the summer conference to the staff members who could offer the most help to them in working in the problem area they defined. The assignment decisions by the project staff were happy ones in every case. The reports from superintendents are warm in their endorsements of persons and programs. Gifts and notes to staff members indicate teacher acceptance.

The door-to-door nature of this program dictated a minimum ratio of faculty to participating system rather than to teacher participants. On a one-third faculty load assignment two staff members served two systems each. A third faculty member was full time in the project; he served five school systems and served as director of the project. During the year four doctoral students gave spot assignment support out of their one-half time assignment to all activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The assignment pattern gave adequate support to seminar sessions but was minimal for the vital service areas of individual conferences, classroom visitation, and demonstration teaching. A single faculty member rarely had time to serve adequately more than four teacher participants in a scheduled school day preceding the after-school two-hour seminar with all the participants from that system. The doctoral candidates doubled the impact of the project during the school days when they were present. Four faculty members and two doctoral candidates outside the project staff contributed voluntarily a total of ten service days to increase the impact of the project on the activities carried on in the rooms of individual teachers.

The experiences of this past year suggest that a faculty member can effectively, and with continued enthusiasm, serve two school systems, spending a full day in each on alternate weeks. This can be done with great benefit to the system and to his own campus teaching and research. The impact of the project on a given system could be increased significantly, and with a modest increase in cost, by assigning a doctoral candidate to work full-time alongside each faculty member in the field.

4. Orientation Program

Three one-week summer conferences were planned as orientation and problem identification experiences for the participants. Three locations were chosen which made it possible for school systems to elect participation in that one to which its team of participants could easily drive each of the five days. Each formally enrolled participant attended one of the three one-week conferences.

The project staff worked together very closely in a series of spring (1969) planning conferences. The summer conferences for participants were then scheduled with at least one week separating them so that further team planning could be done back on the campus. The second and third summer conferences then reflected changes, hopefully improvements, which were suggested by experiences in the preceding conferences. During each one-week conference in the field the project staff traveled together and spent the entire week at the conference site. Members of the staff were housed at the same motel and regularly ate together. Each day included at least one conference of the team for review and preparation. The dialogue, which the contact during the spring and summer made possible, generated an openness within the team which continued throughout the school year of the project. The frequent sharing of observations resulted in many minor modifications of program. Typical of these modifications was the increased emphasis by each staff member on reading to children in classrooms and the expanded attention to problem-solving techniques in the seminars for teacher participants.

5. Program Operation

This program was initially guided by three specific objectives:

1. Each teacher participant will evidence greater mastery of the content of his subject matter area and more effective strategies for teaching that content to his students.
2. Each teacher participant will examine the school program of the middle and junior high years for its

relevance to the needs of the children he teaches and make recommendations concerning that program.

3. Each teacher will analyze, in a biracial setting, the problems he faces as a faculty member in a school system committed to elimination of the dual pattern of schools and design strategies for meeting those problems.

Two developments altered the initially intended focus on the above objectives. First, the requirements that all participants be teachers in the middle and junior high years was removed in order to recruit an adequate number of participants. Second, each system team was encouraged to define a problem to which the entire group could give support for the school year.

These two developments combined to limit the attention given to the first and second objectives listed. The focus on content mastery became, in most of the systems, a teacher by teacher concern. Help in the content areas was extended to individuals who requested it through conferences and classroom visits and demonstrations. The project staff member assigned to a particular system either responded himself to the request for support in a content area or enlisted the aid of another team member or a voluntary consultant who possessed the needed skills. Many teacher participants did not request support in their content areas; evaluation of the progress of those who did request help was made informally and subjectively. Observations over the year have convinced the project staff that more formalized, more consistent, and more uniformly available support should be provided for teacher participants in the content areas.

In order to make the program initially attractive to leaders in rural school systems it became necessary to ignore the plan to include only teachers in the middle and junior high grades. Every grade level was represented among the teacher participants. The second objective stated above was, therefore, altered to allow for the grade spread. Attention was drawn repeatedly during the project year to the question of relevance of the school program. The success of the team was only modest, however, in causing teachers to generate recommendations for change. The project year, viewed in retrospect, was primarily a year of establishing rapport with teachers who have, in most cases, been without classroom supervisory support. The project staff believes most of the teachers served are only now prepared to examine critically the total school program.

The third objective stated above was held effectively at focus in each of the school systems served. Of the eight seminar groups, six were biracial; two were all Negro. In each seminar series, however, each problem area was analyzed for its particular significance in the move to a unitary school system. Each of the school systems served is committed to a plan of total integration effective with the opening of school in late August, 1970.

As each school system team present in a summer conference defined its own problem area for year-long study, goals and objectives specific for each system were generated. The major contribution of the total project, according to the staff, was the opportunity given to each school group to set its own goals and to share in planning ways to reach those goals. The goals set by the teams of teachers ranged from very specific to quite general, from "to develop a program of social studies that will be attractive to students in grades 10, 11, and 12" to "to help all teachers develop a greater knowledge of, and sensitivity to, the special needs and characteristics of disadvantaged students."

When the goals were specific, efforts to reach them determined the activities of the assigned faculty member both in his contacts with individual teachers during his school day service and in the afternoon seminar sessions with all the participants from that system. When the goal defined by the teacher team was very general, however, efforts toward that goal were central only in the seminar activities; in his contacts with individual teachers during the day the project staff member, instead, planned his activities primarily in response to requests from individuals.

In every case the combination of individual classroom contacts and seminars with the total teacher team gave rewarding opportunity to relate the substantive effort of the program to the classroom, the school, and the school system.

Each project faculty member found some variation of the critical incident technique to be very valuable in working with the teacher participants in this project. The "Teaching Problems Laboratory" developed by Donald R. Cruickshank for Science Research Associates and the 16-mm film series "Critical Moments in Teaching" available from Holt, Rinehart and Winston proved to be excellent devices for involving teachers without personal threat in problems which are typical of the ones they face. By the end of the year many teachers were willing to present their own critical incidents for group consideration.

Another set of materials which makes use of the critical incident technique has been prepared by Donald Cruickshank for Science Research Associates. These materials will be most useful in follow-up seminars.

This kit bears the name "Inner-City Simulation Laboratory". It has, for the purposes of this project, a major advantage over the earlier "Teaching Problems Laboratory". In the "Inner-City" kit a majority of the children involved in the problem situations are black. The need to turn to the materials mentioned here emphasizes the dearth of material prepared for use with children in rural areas, particularly black children there.

Faculty members found that a very effective way to gain admission into classrooms of teacher participants who were threatened by the presence of the staff member was to offer to read to the children for a period. This technique provided a way to introduce teachers to new books and to provide for children in these areas an experience which has been distressingly rare. Reading to children as a teaching technique was thus introduced, to many for the first time, and an atmosphere was created in which teachers felt increasingly free to ask questions concerning other of their classroom activities.

The blend of the one-week summer conference and year-long classroom visitations and seminars in the teacher's own environment gave opportunity for the kinds of activities hoped for by the project staff. Following the one-week summer conference each team received 18 full days of service from the same faculty member. The 18 days were spaced essentially equally throughout the 36 weeks of the school year. The staff is convinced that the benefits of contact with teachers over an extended period are far greater than those realized in a shorter and more concentrated exchange.

For the participants the project ended with the close of the school year. Only at that time were many of the teachers beginning to seek the personal help that had been offered to them repeatedly throughout the school year. A more productive time period for this effort would have been two years. Some of the advantages of the extended time period, the primary one being more contacts with the assigned faculty member, could be won by increasing the staff so that a given system would receive service each week of the school year rather than on alternate weeks. For too many of the teachers served by this project, with the removal of the resources of the project, no supervisory help is available other than from the principal. Any plan which could extend the duration of the support of this project should be considered.

Planning for this project began officially on January 14, 1969. The funded period ended on July 31, 1970. The three one-week conferences were held in:

1. Tennille, Georgia-----------------June 16-20, 1969
2. Forsyth and Zebulon, Georgia------July 7-11, 1969
3. Montezuma, Georgia----------------July 21-25, 1969.

The service to the individual school systems began on appropriate dates during September, 1969, and continued throughout the school year which closed in May, 1970.

The developers of this project anticipated in their initial planning and in their year-long refinement of the program in the field a continuation of support in some form to the participating systems for at least one more school year. The developmental nature of this project can be sensed by comparing this report written at the end of the project year with the set of papers found in Appendix A. Those papers were prepared for presentation at the national conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development held in San Francisco on March 16, 1970. They provide a comprehensive report on the program operation to that point.

6. Evaluation

When the opportunity to work with teachers in depth in their content areas did not develop, plans to assess change in that area were abandoned. Other planned measures then became even more important to the project staff.

The following measuring devices were used with each participant. Where it was judged to have meaning a preliminary assessment was made in September for each measure listed, and a terminal assessment was made in May.

Informal Devices

1. Each participant was asked to submit a randomly selected lesson plan from any subject field for any period of time.
2. Each participant was asked to submit a teacher-made test covering any of his teaching activites for any period of time.
3. Each participant was asked to submit, at the end of the year only, the number of students he was recommending for retention together with a report of the number of his retentions for the preceding three years.

Consideration of the data gathered in the first two cases above indicated little change in the total group in the type or quality of lesson plans or teacher-made tests prepared. At the end of the year few of the participants were fashioning their lesson plan objectives in measurable terms. Fewer still had developed test items which demanded anything other than simple recall.

The project staff takes encouragement, however, from the fact that some teachers were attempting by the end of the year to write behavioral objectives to guide their lesson activities and that some were planning activites to gain written and oral responses from students that were somewhere other than at the lowest cognitive level. Some few were exploring ways to assess student behavior in the affective and psychomotor domains. Before the 1969 summer conferences these teachers had not experienced a challenge to their lesson plans and their tests. They had been uninformed concerning the possible contributions to those teaching devices of behavioral objectives and levels and domains of learning.

The analysis of retention data proved to be inconclusive in assessing any contribution of the project team to the changes observed. First, many of the teachers could not, or were reluctant to, produce a record for the last three years. Second, each of the systems during the year announced definite plans to move to a unitary school system with the opening of school in 1970. Associated with this announcement was an appeal to teachers to work with each child, now and particularly in 1970, "at his own level." These announcements seemed to stimulate a relaxation of "standards" on the part of many teachers, at least insofar as retention was concerned. Members of the project staff regularly and consistently emphasized in the summer conferences, in the seminars, and in individual conferences the nonproductiveness of retention. The data do show that the number of students recommended for retention by the teachers participating in this project decreased from the number so recommended in previous years, but the project staff members feel there were other and much more powerful forces in each system that brought about the reduction. The reduction appears, unfortunately, to be far more a response to what is conceived to be system policy than a change based on the individual teacher's new knowledge of how and why children learn.

Formal Devices

1. Tennessee Self Concept Scale

   The staff hypothesized that a year of biweekly contact with a concerned professional would elevate the teacher participant's estimate of his basic worth. The self-criticism scale of this instrument was used to measure change in that direction.

2. Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

   This instrument was used to assess any change in the school climate during the school year, as perceived by the teacher participants.

3. Measures of Attitudes (by Semantic Differential)

   An assessment of change of attitudes during the year by the participants was sought concerning ten elements of their school environment:

   1. This In-Service Program
   2. The Economically Deprived Child
   3. Myself
   4. A Negro Teacher
   5. A White Teacher
   6. Negro Principals
   7. White Principals
   8. Other Teachers
   9. A Negro Child
   10. A White Child

4. Objectives of Programs for the Disadvantaged

   Each participant was asked to assign rank importance to sixteen objectives for programs for disadvantaged students.

5. Program Practices for Disadvantaged Children

   Each participant was asked to assign a priority rating of 1 to 5 to each of 24 program practices for disadvantaged children.

Each of the five assessment devices listed immediately above was administered to the participants present in September; each was again administered to those present in May. School system groups of tests were kept separate and are, therefore, identifiable for studies of changes in individual school systems. Anonymity was assured, however, for any individual teacher who desired it; most elected anonymity on all instruments. The inability to identify individuals was a serious limitation only in the analyses which would have otherwise been possible on the results of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. A copy of each the five instruments discussed immediately above is included in Appendix B.

On the following six pages will be found the analyses of the data from the use of the five instruments listed above. In an attempt to gain complete objectivity the project staff obtained professional evaluation services from EPIC, Diversified Systems Corporation, Tucson, Arizona, for the analyses of the test results. Dr. Michael G. Hunter, Systems Consultant, EPIC, supervised the analyses of the data from the five instruments; all of the raw data were shipped to him in Tucson and, at this writing, are still in his hands. His report, in its original form, constitutes the following six pages of this report. Page numbers were added to Dr. Hunter's sheets and these were then copied for inclusion here.

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

SELF-CRITICISM

TABLE 1

MATCHED PAIRS T-TESTS ON SELF-CRITICISM SCORES FOR THOSE SELF CONCEPT SCALE THAT COULD BE MATCHED BY INDIVIDUALS

County	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	Standard Error	n	t
Washington	3.63	3.33	.10	19	-2.00
Twiggs	3.31	2.96	.13	8	-2.69*
Pike	3.40	3.70	Not Computed	2	Not Computed
Greene	3.37	3.47	"	4	"
Total	3.50	3.33	.07	33	-2.43**

* Significant at .05 level. The two-tailed t value for .05 level and 7 degrees of freedom is 2.36.

** Significant at .05 level. The two-tailed t value for .05 level and 32 degrees of freedom is 2.04.

The self-criticism score was computed by summing the numerical responses on the ten self-criticism items and dividing by ten: the minimum possible score was 1.00 and the maximum possible score was 5.00.

The analysis in Table 1 shows that over all matched scales, total, the degree self-criticism decreased significantly. Also, the self-criticism decreased significantly for Twiggs County and almost significantly for Washington County. It was felt that the number of matches for Pike and Greene Counties was too small to merit a statistical analysis on a county basis.

TABLE 2

PRE AND POST MEAN SELF-CRITICISM SCORES BY COUNTIES

County*	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean
Dodge	3.03	2.53
Greene	3.32	3.61
Monroe	3.50	3.50
Pike	3.58	3.34
Twiggs	3.23	2.99
Washington	3.63	3.26
Sumter-Schley	3.22	3.23

* There were no post-tests for Macon County.

TABLE 3

MATCHED PAIRS T-TEST COMPARING PRE AND POST SELF-CRITICISM SCORES BY COUNTY

Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	Standard Error	n	t
3.36	3.22	0.1	7	-1.40

While the mean self-criticism scores shown in Table 2 did decrease from pre-test to post-test, the t-test presented in Table 3 shows that this decrease was not statistically significant.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

Items 14, 18, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 42, 46, 50, 51, 55, 60, 63, 64, 67, 71, 73, and 77 of the OCD Questionnaire were considered to be "negative" items and were scored the reverse of the remaining items. Items 79 and 80 were not scored.

The average pre-test and post-test response was calculated by county: minimum possible score was one and maximum possible score was four. A higher score indicates a more positive attitude toward the organization. Table 4 shows the comparison of the mean pre and post responses by county.

TABLE 4

MATCHED PAIRS T-TEST COMPARING MEAN PRE AND POST RESPONSES ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, BY COUNTY.

County	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	Standard Error	n	t
Washington	2.63	2.49	-	-	-
Twiggs	2.67	2.61	-	-	-
Monroe	2.73	2.67	-	-	-
Pike	2.68	2.45	-	-	-
Sumter-Schley	2.74	2.76	-	-	-
Greene	2.51	2.52	-	-	-
Dodge	2.54	2.52	-	-	-
Total	2.64	2.57	.03	7	-2.33

Two-tailed $t_{(.05,\ 6)} = 2.46$

While the t value in Table 4 was not significant, it was nearly so. The negative sign of the t value indicates a less positive attitude.

Semantic Differential

A total of fifty pre and post semantic differentials were matched by individuals; the total number of possible matches was ninety-three. Because this represents a better than fifty percent match, it was felt that an analysis of the non-matching data was not necessary.

The semantic differentials were scored using standard procedures. The possible range of scores was from 120 to 840 with a higher score representing a more positive attitude.

Table 5 contains the analysis comparing pre and post scores, by individuals, for counties and the total sample.

TABLE 5

MATCHED PAIRS T-TESTS COMPARING PRE AND POST SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES, BY INDIVIDUALS, FOR COUNTIES AND TOTAL SAMPLE.

County	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	Standard Error	n	t
Washington	583.27	595.40	14.10	15	.86
Twiggs	601.36	607.72	17.69	11	.36
Greene	603.50	574.75	-	4	-
Pike	573.64	539.36	21.87	11	-1.57
Monroe	557.89	553.78	18.86	9	- .23
Total	582.18	576.64	8.61	50	- .64

The t values shown in Table 5 indicate that there was no change in attitude, as measured by the semantic differential, between pre and post testing.

Rank of Objectives

The mean ranking, over all individuals, given to each of the sixteen objectives was computed. The rankings were made such that the lower the mean ranking the more basic the objective. A rating of "1" indicates that the objective must be met before all others, while a ranking of "16" indicates that the objective would be last to be met.

TABLE 6

RANKINGS OF SIXTEEN OBJECTIVES

Objective	Pre Mean Ranking	Rank	Post Mean Ranking	Rank
1	5.91	3	6.56	6
2	5.90	2	5.95	1
3	6.85	7	6.03	3
4	6.32	5	6.15	5
5	5.38	1	6.10	4
6	12.39	16	10.60	14
7	7.86	9	6.09	3
8	6.14	4	7.49	8
9	9.96	11	8.96	9
10	11.29	14	10.18	13
11	10.64	13	11.01	15
12	7.48	8	9.48	11
13	11.70	15	12.37	16
14	9.06	10	9.38	10
15	6.62	6	6.95	7
16	10.50	12	10.12	12

The pre and post ranks given in Table 6 were compared using a Spearman rank order correlation. The correlation between pre and post ranks was .83 indicating little change in the relative ranking of the objectives.

Rank of Statements

The relative value placed on the twenty-four statements was analyzed in the same fashion as was the ranking of the objectives. A low rating of a statement indicated a high value for that statement. The pre and post mean ranks and ranks of the mean ranks are given in Table 7. The Spearman correlation, with ties broken in a manner so as to make a more conservative test, was .97. This extremely high correlation indicates almost no change in the relative ranks of the statements from pre-test to post-test.

TABLE 7

RANKINGS OF THE VALUES OF TWENTY-FOUR STATEMENTS

Statement	Pre Mean Rank	Pre Rank	Post Mean Rank	Post Rank
1	2.03	15	2.28	18.5
2	4.43	24	4.53	24
3	2.83	20	2.71	22
4	3.67	23	3.40	23
5	2.84	21	2.51	20
6	1.96	10	1.89	10
7	1.76	6	1.79	6
8	1.60	2.5	1.78	5
9	1.96	11	2.04	14
10	2.09	16	1.95	12
11	2.21	18	2.12	17
12	2.00	13	2.08	16
13	1.63	4	1.62	3
14	2.18	17	2.05	15
15	2.86	22	2.59	21
16	1.86	9	1.87	9
17	2.50	19	2.28	18.5
18	1.57	1	1.47	1
19	2.01	14	2.00	13
20	1.60	2.5	1.57	2
21	1.81	7	1.82	7
22	1.69	5	1.74	4
23	1.86	8	1.86	8
24	1.99	12	1.90	11

III. Conclusions

This project has furnished personal, concerned, and professional assistance to 120 teachers in ten school systems over the period of one full school year. More than 130 additional teachers in the cooperating school systems have received instructional support on at least one occasion.

The teachers addressed through this project are located in rural, isolated, majority Negro school systems where many of the students must be considered disadvantaged. The teachers are themselves disadvantaged in that they lack normally expected instructional support; particularly do they lack supervisory support for the improvement of learning activities in their classrooms.

The most important immediate contributions of this project have resulted from efforts: (1) to introduce, and guide the implementation of, more appropriate instructional methods in classrooms and (2) to review and update individual teachers in their content areas. Many of the teachers reached through this project reflect changes in both their knowledge and their methods.

The contribution most important for the future, however, may well be the changes in attitude effected. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale results give reason to believe that the teachers served have become less critical of themselves; this suggests a more positive attitude by them for the future. This change occurred in the course of the school year. We can only surmise the contribution of project activities to that change, but our observations of the local school systems indicate that project activities were the only supportive ones not normally present. Staff members are persuaded that their presence in the schools resulted in a continually increasing degree of openness on the part of classroom teachers during the year. The knowledge that help from staff members was available, without strings attached and with no other motive than that of helping children through their teachers, seemed to generate in many of the teachers involved a new perspective concerning supervisory support generally.

The major strength of this project lay in its conduct in the field rather than on the college campus. Many of the teachers served have, for many reasons, been unwilling to expose their needs in college classrooms. There they either feel threatened or judge that the problems addressed are not their own. Teacher involvement and support was won as each school system team identified its central problem for year-long study and action. Individual teachers were won as their needs within their classrooms were identified, respected, and addressed.

The major weakness of the project was its failure to effect, for every teacher involved, an increase in knowledge in a content area. The range of grade levels represented by the participants was from one through twelve, and all content interests were represented. Only in one case did school team members identify a problem for the school year that focused on content--in that case secondary social studies. In every other situation invitations to the participants to seek help leading to content acquisition were extended regularly by the assigned staff members, but initiating the contact was made the responsibility of the individual teacher. Very few responded initially; during the school year increasing numbers sought help; some of the teacher participants still have not sought support in content acquisition.

School system leadership was, without exception, supportive of our efforts in their schools. We were given complete freedom to go and come in schools and classrooms. Members of the project team were committed to meeting the needs of individual teachers; they were patient, consistent, and thorough as they invited and then responded to any need expressed by the teacher participants. These two elements--local school leadership and the project team--were the major contributors to success in this project.

Failures, where they occurred, seem to relate to the wide range of grade levels and content interests represented among the participants. The seminars were designed to involve all participants and, therefore, could not address content needs of individuals. The inability of local systems to provide either released time or stipend payment for seminar experiences was another factor which limited success; all seminars were held after the close of the school day and participants were, generally, present without financial reward. More time is needed in each school system for such in-service activities; stipend support for participants for after-school activities should be made available from either the local school or the project budget.

There were no unique features in this project, but perhaps the blend was unique. The one-week drive-in summer conference preceding the year-long individual school programs provided an overview and problem identification opportunity which gave direction to the year-long effort. Seminars conducted biweekly throughout the school year drew on critical incident techniques including simulation to focus on the team-determined interest for the year. During the regular school hours on seminar days the assigned staff members worked with individual teachers in their classrooms in any way suggested by the teacher participants.

In the final analysis, the staff believes that we have made it possible for many teachers who have been without appropriate instructional support, and who have felt threatened in their isolation, to accept--some even to seek--help with their instructional problems. But we have made a start only. This type of instructional support must be continued if the gains registered are to be preserved and, certainly, if further progress is to be made.

IV. Appendix

On the following pages will be found materials which augment certain of the ideas presented in the previous pages.

There is no report from the Measurement Research Center of Iowa; none has been received from that agency.

The following appendices are included:

Appendix A ... ~~(see yellow tab)~~ Papers prepared by staff members for presentation at the National Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) held in San Francisco on March 16, 1970.

Appendix B ... ~~(see blue tab)~~ Formal Devices Used in Evaluation

Appendix C ... ~~(see red tab)~~
1. Roster of Participants
2. Schedules for Summer Conferences
3. Summer Conference Evaluation Form -- Sample
4. Problem Identification Sheet -- Sample
5. Problem Identfication Summary -- by Counties
6. Illustrative Seminar Schedules

APPENDIX A

PAPERS PREPARED BY STAFF MEMBERS
FOR PRESENTATION AT THE NATIONAL
CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR
SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (ASCD)
HELD IN SAN FRANCISCO ON MARCH 16, 1970

Special Session No. 21
Monday, March 16, 1970
1:30 - 3:30 p.m.
Room 408/410 Civic Auditorium

INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR TEACHERS OF RURAL DISADVANTAGED

PROGRAM (in order of appearance)

Introduction	RAY E. BRUCE Associate Professor Department of Curriculum and Supervision
1. Evolution of the Rural Isolated Project	JOHN C. REYNOLDS Assistant Professor Department of Curriculum and Supervision
2. Design for Implementing a Project for Instructional Improvement in Ten Rural, Isolated, Majority Negro, Georgia School Districts	MARTIN A. McCULLOUGH Associate Professor and Chairman Department of Curriculum and Supervision
3. The Summer Conferences and the Year-Long Effort	SHIRLEE D. JEFFERSON Graduate Assistant Division of Elementary Education
4. Characteristics of Participating School Systems	ROBERT W. SELWA Graduate Assistant Department of Curriculum and Supervision
5. Professional Personnel in the Participating School Districts	BRUCE G. GORDON Graduate Assistant Department of Curriculum and Supervision
6. Instructional Strengths and Weaknesses	J. MICHAEL PALARDY Assistant Professor Division of Elementary Education
7. Instructional Strengths and Weaknesses in the Language Arts and Physical Education Programs	BRUCE G. GORDON
8. Types of Questions and Requests that Project Teachers Have Made of Me	GERARD F. LENTINI Graduate Assistant Department of Curriculum and Supervision
9. In-Service Education for Teachers of the Rural Disadvantaged	RAY E. BRUCE

(All participants are from the College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601 404-542-1343)

EVOLUTION OF THE RURAL ISOLATED PROJECT

John C. Reynolds
Assistant Professor
University of Georgia

During the 1967-68 academic year the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, contracted with the University of Miami to research a perplexing problem. This report, "A Summary Report of Six School Systems", had as its basic concern to find if 242 majority black school systems in seventeen southern and border states faced problems in achieving unitary schools which were unique to them. These 242 systems made up 10 per cent of all the systems in the seventeen states but accounted for about 50 per cent of those systems in which federal funds had been terminated for non-compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The following questions were explored. Did these systems have unique problems? What was the best way to move from majority black dual school systems to unitary schools? Was the Civil Rights Act of 1964 promoting negative effects on these systems rather than positive effects?

To reduce the investigation to manageable proportions, the study was conducted in three southern states in which the state departments of education gave approval and assistance. No effort was made to secure a statistically valid sampling of the 242 black majority systems. Pragmatic considerations indicated the undesirability if not the impossibility of such scientific treatment. Six school districts were selected in conferences with state department officials and personnel from seven university-based consulting centers funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. According to the report of the study, the six systems studied were chosen by state educational leaders as being broadly representative of those which enrolled a minority of white students.

A team of educators visited each of the six school systems to study the total school operation and the status of desegregation. Strengths and weaknesses were recorded for the six systems; the findings were summarized by the investigators into thirteen conclusions. Each of the conclusions implies a distinct need. The study also set forth seventy-three recommendations for school improvement. These recommendations were associated with one of six problem areas: (1) pupils, (2) personnel, (3) courses of study, (4) buildings, (5) transportation, and (6) feeder patterns. Each of the recommendations presumably addresses a need identified for the majority black school systems.

The designers of this project have accepted the University of Miami study, "A Summary Report of Six School Systems", as documentation of the needs of majority black school districts. They have planned a program to address the needs suggested by the conclusions and recommendations in the "Summary Report" which are most immediately subject to action by and/or with the classroom teacher. Two of the thirteen conclusions fall into this category. They are:

H. Many schools were very traditionally oriented and failed to meet the needs of individual children.

The districts enrolling a majority of black children seemed to be more traditional than most schools. There was less evidence of the new curricula (in biology, physics, mathematics, etc.) and less evidence of children being taught in other than class-sized groups. When a large number of children of low experiential background were gathered together, as they were in black majority districts, methods should have been sought to individualize instruction.

K. There was a need for better in-service training for teachers.

Relatively few programs of in-service education for teachers were found, but there appeared to be a great need for such activity. In some places, a number of multi-sensory teaching aids had been purchased, usually with ESEA Title I funds, but the teachers did not understand the purpose and operation of it. Many teachers displayed little or no understanding of children of a race different from their own. Also considered was the fact that small group instruction, reduction of class size, additions of educational technology, and all the other educational advances meant nothing if the teacher continued to teach in the same old way. For better learning, better teaching would be required. Then the choice would be one of waiting for faculty replacement or in-service education. The children who were then in school could not wait for faculty replacement.

Of the seventy-three recommendations offered in the "Summary Report" for improving the conditions reflected in their conclusions, the following seven (drawn from the categories of "Personnel" and "Courses of Study") are identified as needs, elements of which can be meaningfully addressed through this project.

PERSONNEL

5. It is recommended that all teachers be required to participate in training programs that will assist them to deal effectively with the problems unique to the desegregation process.
6. It is recommended that all teachers be included in planning for curriculum change and materials development.

10. It is recommended that means be made available by the school system for teachers to upgrade their skills.

12. It is recommended that teachers receive in-service instruction in the use of teaching aids.

13. It is recommended that more in-service meetings, workshops or other sessions be provided for school personnel.

COURSES OF STUDY

5. It is recommended that more attention be given to exploratory activities, curricular and co-curricular, so that the interests of each student may be explained.

14. It is recommended that teachers become familiar with innovative techniques and practices, using related and current materials in addition to textbooks.

Following the completion of the University of Miami study in late spring of 1968, the University of Georgia was asked by members of the Rural Isolated Task Force, whose leadership resides in the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Office of Education, to plan an institute to begin in June of 1968 for teams of teachers from the six school systems studied. An on-campus institute was planned and in two three-week sessions accommodated 179 teachers from the six districts.

The experiences of the institute staff in working with the participants and in visiting the six districts gave support to the conclusions made in the "Summary Report". In summary, there is a need for increased competencies on the part of those who teach in majority black school districts.

The conclusions and recommendations of the "Summary Report" were utilized in developing this project. Specifically, how could these findings be utilized in a practical approach to these problems in Georgia? This project has attempted to meet these problems through an in-service approach which depends heavily on field work in the schools involved in the project.

Specifically, the purpose of this project is summarized in the following statements:

> This project purposes to give teachers in the middle and junior high grades of ten rural, isolated, majority Negro, Georgia school districts the opportunity to increase their professional competencies. Through a one-week summer, 1969, instructional conference and biweekly, in-district training sessions throughout the 1969-70 academic year the project staff will seek to lead teachers to: (1) evidence greater knowledge of, and more effective teaching strategies within, their subject matter areas; (2) examine and make proposals concerning the school program of the middle and junior high grades and its relevance for disadvantaged children and potential drop-outs; (3) analyze, in a biracial setting, problems faced by faculty members in school systems committed to elimination of the dual school system.

DESIGN FOR IMPLEMENTING A PROJECT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN TEN RURAL, ISOLATED, MAJORITY NEGRO, GEORGIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Martin A. McCullough
Associate Professor
University of Georgia

I. Mission and Objectives

A. Mission To give teachers in the middle and junior high grades of ten rural, isolated, majority Negro, Georgia school districts the opportunity to increase their professional competencies.

B. Objectives Given a one-week instructional workshop during the summer, 1969, and bi-weekly, in-district training sessions throughout the 1969-70 academic year, participants will demonstrate through verbal and written behaviors and in their classroom teaching behaviors:

- Greater knowledge of content within their teaching areas
- Greater knowledge and usage of different teaching strategies
- Increased perceptions of the revelance of their classroom program for disadvantaged students and potential drop-outs
- Greater usage of strategies that make their classroom program more revelant for disadvantaged children (to include potential drop-outs)

II. Strategy for Change

A. Establish with participants a "human to human" relationship that goes deeper than the normal university professor-public school personnel "role" interaction (i.e. develop non-threatening relationship based on support and acceptance)

B. Develop a program that can be effective without the involvement of formal power structure (superintendent, etc.)

C. Develop a program that will result in improvement within existing resources available to teachers and within the limits of existing school structure

D. Utilize problem solving process by participants to determine "focus" of change

E. Utilize project staff members primarily as facilitators and resource persons

F. Stay within realities of participants' current teaching situation

G. Develop relationship with a small number of school districts (10) and establish a team of participants from each school district

III. Design

A. Staffing The identification and selection of persons to work on this project reflected direct implementation of the strategy presented in section II. A working set of criteria was developed: (1) project staff members should have extensive public school experience, (2) project staff members should possess a degree of openness and understanding needed to relate with participants, (3) project staff members should be knowledgeable about disadvantaged learners, and (4) project staff members should be able to relate completely and effectively with participants on a one to one and/or small group basis.

Initial selection of the pool of prospective project staff members was based on these criteria. There was some self-selection out of consideration for the project because of involvement with rural, isolated school districts was perceived accurately to be more demanding and time consuming than routine university teaching assignments. Final selection of the three persons to work with the project director then was based primarily on the individual's ability to relate in an open and non-threatening manner to participants.

B. Participants The project proposed to involve up to 250 teachers who work with disadvantaged students in ten rural, isolated school districts in Georgia. The design used to select participants was as follows: (1) With the assistance of the Georgia State Department of Education, a roster of majority black, rural, isolated school districts was developed. (2) Letters of introduction and explanation were sent to superintendents of the above districts. (3) All responses were followed up with a personal visit by the project director regardless of location in the state or distance from the University of Georgia campus. (4) Additional referrals were solicited from the State Department of Education and from members of the College of Education based on personal knowledge of school districts identified in Item 1.

After thorough consultation the final selection of ten school districts was made on the basis of need and commitment to an in-service program of this type.

C. In-Service

The in-service design was based on sixty (60) clock hours of contact with project personnel. Each teacher participated in a one-week summer (1969) instructional conference of 24 contact hours with the project staff and 18 bi-weekly training sessions, each involving two (2) contact hours with the project staff during the 1969-70 academic year. In addition to the two hour training sessions, the project staff members are available for classroom visits and consultation with individual participants during the school hours or the day of each bi-weekly training session.

- Instructional Conference Summer, 1969 -- During the summer of 1969 a task force of four faculty members and four doctoral students from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, College of Education, University of Georgia, conducted one-week instructional conferences in each of three school centers situated within commuting distance of approximately one-third of the participants.

  The one-week conferences were designed to fulfill two purposes: (1) to provide cognitive imputs selected from the general area of "teaching the disadvantaged" and (2) to initiate and develop as far as possible a process of problem solving by teams of teachers from each school district that would culminate in identification of specific areas for study during the academic year.

- Academic Year (1969-70) Bi-Weekly Seminars The year-long bi-weekly sessions are related directly to those specific instructional problems judged by the local district faculty and the project staff to be most crucial. The staff member assigned to a local district was the one whose training and experience best prepared him for service in the problem area defined for that district.

D. Evaluation   Evaluation design was developed to measure change in participant (teacher) behavior. A major array of informal devices were selected to furnish indices as to the effectiveness of strategies of teaching content. Selection of these was limited to methods normally used by teachers: (1) comparison of lesson plans written by teachers at the beginning and at the end of the project, (2) comparison of teacher made-tests at the beginning and at the end of the project, and (3) promotion-retention record for each teacher for the school year 1969-70 will be compared with the records for the previous three years.

To measure the degrees to which teachers have changed their attitudes concerning concepts deemed important, two measures will be employed near the beginning and end of the project year. The first is the "Opinion Questionnaire, Culturally and Economically Disadvantaged Children and Youth, Form S-1," a revision by E. Paul Torrance and Anthony J. Cichoke, Department of Educational Psychology, the University of Georgia, for assessing attitudes toward: "This Summer's Institute," "The Economically Deprived Child," "Myself," "A Negro Teacher," "A White Teacher," "Negro Principals," "White Principals," "Other Teachers," "A Negro Child," and "A White Child." Both of the latter measures were employed in the pilot institute at the University of Georgia during the summer of 1968 and provide data for comparison. In addition, the Tennessee Self-Concept scale will be used.

A terminal evaluation report will be prepared by the project staff immediately preceding the close of the project year. This report will include findings of the individual evaluation approaches listed above.

THE SUMMER CONFERENCES AND THE YEAR-LONG EFFORT

Shirlee D. Jefferson
Graduate Assistant
University of Georgia

Each participant in the project was offered a week's conference in the summer of 1969 and a continued program throughout the school year 1969-70.

For the team members, this meant four separate summer conferences in four different centers; a conference was held June 16-20 at Tennille, Georgia, two simultaneous conferences were held at Forsyth and Zebulon the week of July 7-11, and a fourth conference was held in Montezuma July 21-26. Ten counties were represented in the four conferences, a total of 115 people. Graduate course credit was available for those who wanted to make the arrangements.

The team members who are here today are all from the College of Education at the University of Georgia in Athens. There were six of us on the summer team; Dr. Ray E. Bruce, Director of the project, Dr. Martin A. McCullough, Dr. J. Michael Palardy, and Dr. John C. Reynolds. Bob Selwa and I, graduate assistants in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, rounded out the summer team. Dr. Keith Osborn, Professor of Early Childhood Education, discussed early growth and development patterns of disadvantaged children with three of the conference groups.

For each summer conference the team arrived on location Sunday afternoon and remained in the area until the conference was concluded on Friday. The teachers, principals, and supervisors participating in the conferences drove in every morning and returned home in the afternoons.

Monday morning of each conference began with the introduction of staff and participants, gathering necessary information, and such mandane necessities as making lunch arrangements. Our conference day was from 8:30 to 2:30. The team members had particular topics to present and a tentative schedule for the week was arranged, providing for presentations on these topics; Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Teacher Expectancy, Teaching Strategies, Current Curriculum Developments, Interaction Analysis, Importance of the Self-Concept, Instructional Media, and Literature Concerning the Disadvantaged. The topics were presented in many ways: lectures with exhibited materials and audio-visual aids, group discussion, group activities, demonstration and the use of various hand-outs. The schedule also included use of related films, conference evaluation, county group meetings, and of course, lunch and other appropriate breaks.

Toward the end of the week after much material had been presented and discussed, the participants met by county groups to select a single problem on which to focus for the year-long program, with the understanding that one of the faculty members on the team would work with each county group in the problem area in which they would choose to concentrate their concern and efforts. Problems chosen were:

Improving the self-concepts of pupils

Understanding and helping the underachieving student

Increasing involvement in High School social studies classes

Effecting a positive change among students in the area of self-concept development

Developing improved techniques for working with disadvantaged through self-evaluation

Improving teacher attitude toward disadvantaged students

Increasing the vocabulary of disadvantaged children

Developing instructional techniques and improvements in the curriculum that will aid in the decrease of pupil failure and an increase in attendance

Evaluating teacher attitudes and behavior

When all the conferences were over the faculty members who were to be involved made decisions as to which professor would work with each county, making the decisions partly on the basis of their own special interests and abilities but largely in terms of the ability of the individual team member to relate to specific groups of people.

A few necessary changes in the team took place at the beginning of the school year. Dr. McCullough was not able to continue actively with the project because of his responsibilities as department chairman. Two graduate assistants, Mr. Gordon and Mr. Lentini, who are also here today, are now participating as team members on a regular basis. Mr. Selwa and I have responsibilities in connection with our assistantships which prevent us from participating regularly, but we have been available for spot assignments and have worked with the team in several counties on many occasions. I have worked some with teachers in the language arts area, mainly in literature, reading, and creative dramatics.

A team member works with the teachers in a particular county in this way; every other week, a total of eighteen times in the school year, he spends a day in the county's schools and is available for consultation, observation, or demonstration. He holds a seminar after school for the teachers who were in the summer conference and for any others who are interested. The main purpose of the seminar is to develop ways to work on the problem which was selected for focus in the summer conference. Total participation has increased from 115 in the summer to 149 in the seminars. The effectiveness of the seminar will be evaluated at the end of the year based on feedback from the participants.

Reaction from other faculty members on campus has been widespread. Among those who have indicated an interest in our project are a Children's Literature Specialist, a Sociologist, a Curriculum Specialist, and an Educational Psychologist. Most of these have spent a day with us in the field. Another interested person was Dr. Jane Franseth, Product Manager of Rural Education in the U. S. Office of Education. Dr. Franseth visited several of the project centers.

The potential effectiveness of the project has been hampered in some ways. Many teachers are reluctant to have anyone observing them and have been slow to invite us into their classrooms. We would welcome more interest and participation in this part of the program. Another barrier has been the fact that teachers are tired after a day of teaching, and they have things to do after school. Many find it hard to attend seminars regularly. Most participants are attending without financial reward or college credit. As in any professional growth program, released time would be a great advantage to both teachers and team.

Some of our most enjoyable moments have been in seeing children respond and participate. We have also been happy to see teachers show concern for the problems of these children and make some changes in their approach to teaching.

We all feel strongly that the project should be continued so that our efforts this year to establish trust, communication and conditions for growth could serve as the beginning of real progress.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Robert Selwa
Graduate Assistant
University of Georgia

The ten school systems that this project is involved with are, as the project title indicates, rural. The largest city within any of the counties is Americus, in Sumter County, and has a population of 15,000. Three of the counties do not have a town of over 1,000 population located in the county. The other counties have at least one town with a population of 1,700 to 5,100. The county populations vary from 25,000 to 3,200. Ranking all 159 counties in the State of Georgia by population reveals that the largest of the ten counties ranks 45th and the smallest ranks 155th.

The ten counties are isolated to varying degrees. Two of the counties are within fifty miles of Atlanta. A rock festival was held in Atlanta this past summer and these two counties were close enough to have some overflow of differently dressed and groomed young people. Some negative comment was noted about this by this writer. The remaining eight counties are all within approximately fifty miles of a city of at least 50,000 population.

The economic base of these counties can be classified as basically agricultural. There are within the counties varying types and degrees of industry. Washington County bears the distinction of being the Kaolin Clay Capital of the United States.

The educational system of each of the counties is under the control of a board of education. The size of the board varies from five to seven members. In the majority of counties the board of education is elected directly by the voters. But, in at least one county the board is appointed by the county grand jury. The county grand jury is also an appointed body.

The county superintendents of these ten systems are in the majority of counties elected by the voters. One county does have an appointed superintendent of education and in this particular case the board of education is elected by the voters. The minimum qualifications for all superintendents are set by the State Department of Education. The basic qualification is a masters degree in school administration. Many of the superintendents of the counties served by the project hold sixth year certificates in administration.

Approximately ninety-five percent of the teaching staff of the ten county school systems are fully certified on the basis of a four year college degree. Less than five percent of this group of teachers teach out of their field of certification. At least fifty percent of all teachers have been employed in their county school systems for at least six years. Approximately seventy percent of the instructional staff have been employed in their county for at least three years. Teachers salaries in these systems start at approximately $5,200 and raise to approximately $8,700 with a masters degree and over ten years experience.

There are approximately eleven hundred teachers in the ten systems. This project is directly involved with one hundred forty-nine teachers. The largest system of the ten has approximately one hundred and eighty-five teachers in seven schools. The smallest system has thirty-six teachers in two schools. These two schools each contain grades one through twelve.

The number of system-wide personnel in each county varies from six to none, excluding the superintendent. In the majority of counties the system-wide staff consists of a curriculum director and a visiting teacher. Georgia has a system of nine centers in the state that furnish personnel on a regular basis for supervisory and technical help. Some of the ten systems utilize this help to a great degree.

There are a total of fifty-five schools in all ten systems. Of this total, sixteen schools are organized with grades one through eight. Eleven schools contain grades one through twelve. There is only one school that has a junior high school arrangement of grades six through eight. The junior high grades are usually placed in an elementary school and are an integral part of that school.

The school buildings vary in age from three years to twenty-six years old. The vast majority of buildings contain a library, cafeteria, and office suite. Furnishings are in most cases chairs with attached wooden arm desks. Maintenance, as in any group of schools, varies from needing a general cleaning and repairs to excellent.

The student body of all systems is at least fifty percent black. The vast majority of these black students attend schools that have an all black student body; a relatively small number attend previously all-white schools. The professional staff of these all-black schools are almost fully black in composition. Some schools in the ten systems do not have a full time white staff member assigned. One system has desegregated the instructional staff of all schools on a ratio of black and white teachers in the total county. Each school has the same percent of black and white teachers found in the complete system. Schools within this group of systems have been in the past in compliance with civil rights legislation. The current situation in regard to compliance and desegregation in these ten systems is hard to identify. The central area of the State of Georgia is in a state of flux as to desegregation of school student body and professional staff.

Bussing of black and white is common in all ten systems. The percentage of students who are bussed varies between counties from one hundred percent to thirty percent. The superintendents of several of the districts have estimated that a majority of each graduating class continues their education through trade or vocational schools, junior colleges, colleges, or universities. One superintendent did estimate that for every two white students who continued their education only one black student did. From the data available this writer would estimate that approximately ten percent of the students in each high school grade dropped out of school last year.

The students, teachers, and physical facilities of these ten systems are viewed by this writer as not being greatly different from other rural school systems in Georgia he has been in. This would include systems that have a majority white county and student population. Attitudes toward desegregation in these ten systems range from active demonstrations, counter demonstrations, and marches to calm support and acceptance of legal processes. These systems have entered into this project for many reasons, but the most important one must be that they want to improve the quality of instruction their students are receiving no matter what the present quality is.

PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN THE PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Bruce Gordon
Graduate Assistant
University of Georgia

The view of our entire team is that the success or failure of any educational program is dependent upon the professional staff that mans it and it is through the upgrading of the teaching, administrative and supervisory personnel that the children of all social, cultural and economic levels will derive the greatest benefit.

The professional staff and its members' levels of competencies must be viewed in light of their personal backgrounds, educational preparation and the environmental situations that permeate their daily experiences. There are, and most certainly will continue to be, inadequacies noted in teaching effectiveness but the causative factors must be understood in order to allow us to begin from where we are and move toward the goal of the highest quality education possible for all children.

One way for us to see the schools' personnel in perspective, and especially the segment that we are involved with, either on a direct basis or through contact with the total school faculty during our visitations is to look at a brief analysis of this population.

A. The average number of classroom teachers per school is 18.

B. With respect to the rate of turnover of teachers the average number of new teachers per school during this current school year is 2.2.

C. Looking at the question of the length of service each teacher has had in the particular project area schools, the following breakdown occurs:

1. 0-2 years 17%
2. 3-5 years 19%
3. 6-10 years 24%
4. 11 plus 40%

D. From the standpoint of educational preparation and state certification, .09% of the teachers are not certified and .08% are teaching out of their area of specialization.

E. Of the 149 teachers enrolled in our program, the reasons they listed for teaching where they are were as follows:

12% Like the area of the state
39% Most of their family lives there
13% Husband is employed there
0% Salary is better than other positions
28% Prefer the teaching position to others (likes principal, working conditions, etc.)
8% Others (specify)

F. Looking at the question of do you have or have you had relatives that have taught in your present school system, the breakdown shows 12% have had members of their family in the school.

From a brief look at this data, we can note that there is a very low turnover rate for teachers throughout the systems involved. The rural nature of these schools and a relatively stable pupil population in comparison to rapid urban expansion has meant staff increases have been held proportionately low. It is also evident from our direct contacts with the project members and the subsequent written information from them that they are teaching basically within the region where they grew up and were educated in.

In many of the school systems involved, the only person to whom the teacher has been able to turn in the past for supervisory and curriculum assistance has been the building principal. This may have been an acceptable practice at one time during our educational development but such is no longer true. The lack of money, facilities, trained personnel and the accepted customs of the past have all curtailed the establishment of curriculum and supervisory personnel being made available. As a result of this, teachers who often needed the assistance the most were denied it. With all the factors being considered it developed that the less able were also the least willing to seek out help.

In recent years, a state-wide program has been developed to alleviate this problem and it takes the name of Shared Services. This is a centralized unit that consists of supervisory personnel trained in specific areas who are to assist the teachers in the improvement of the instructional program.

The establishment of Shared Services enabled the smaller school systems to enjoy the benefits of educational specialists that formerly only the large city systems could afford. As of June 1969, there were nine centers located in the State of Georgia. These centers serviced some 42 school systems which, in turn, had a total of 260 elementary and secondary schools.

The personnel of each of these centers varies slightly, but each has a trained staff that has continually expanded since the initiating of the service in 1966. The necessary financial support and availability of personnel are its only limitations to future growth. Each of these centers is headed by a director who works with directors of the other centers in an attempt to coordinate on a state-wide basis. Specialists with 5th year Georgia certification in their area of specialization plus supervisory certification work under the direction of this person. Some of the departments represented and their respective functions include:

A. Pupil Personnel Service Consultant. Carry out psychological testing, consult with the school counselors and work with in-service programs.

B. Vocational Technical Consultant. To evaluate current programs and work with teachers and administrators in the formulation of new or the expansion of existing ones.

C. Reading, Social Studies, Language Arts, Mathematics and Music consultants whose responsibilities for their program areas range from 1st to 12th grade and involve demonstration teaching, in-service programs and evaluation of current texts and materials.

D. A consultant for exceptional education whose primary function is to help expand existing facilities and staff, conduct in-service programs and increase the diagnostic testing program throughout the systems involved.

In the past all the central office personnel were white and only principals of the Negro schools were black. This policy has been altered in the past decade and increased pressures from court rulings and government mandates has hastened the process.

The majority of those participating in our program are black. Sixty percent are enrolled directly in the program and they come from teaching, supervisory and administrative positions. We cannot accurately state their reasons for joining the program as these reasons could be as divergent as yours and mine, and color could have no significant bearing.

The black teachers tend to view whites coming into their schools and offering to help them with the improvement of their instructional program with some degree of skepticism because of what has been true in the past. Lip service was given to an equal educational system, but the reality of that was never achieved. Through this project we, too, have made promises to these educators. These were not grandiose in scope, but were realistic and ones which we have been able to keep. Through this type of approach, we have gradually made inroads toward greater acceptance and our constant contact with principals, supervisors and teachers alike show them opening up more. The blacks, as well as the white participants, talk more freely of their problems and seek out assistance in those areas in which they feel the greatest need.

It is not fair to these people or any group of people to make a blanket statement for all and it is not the purpose to do so here. With their training and the structure of the schools they work in understood, some characteristics of the teaching that goes on can be identified. Included in these are:

A. A strong tendency to be textbook-oriented in all subject-matter areas. The lack of supplemental materials and the acceptance of what was good in the past is still good enough today continues to support this action.

B. Teacher-initiated and planned course sequence and content. Very little pupil-teacher planning has been observed during our classroom visitations.

C. The teaching staff has not been in the position previously to either initiate curriculum innovations or evaluate ones currently in practice. Beyond the fact that this has been their historical policy, the truth in too many cases is that many are not sufficiently trained to handle such a responsibility.

D. The majority of the administrative personnel have not shown the desire to initiate curriculum change through their position. The maintenance of the status quo was often deemed the appropriate measure. An increase of interest on the part of some administrative personnel has been noted recently and it is hoped that this will result in some action.

E. Lack of effective communication between supervisory personnel and the teaching staff. This is not a problem unique to the population we are involved with, but its resultant effect is of a much greater magnitude because of the high need level that is apparent.

F. A gradual upturn in the degree and quality of teacher, administrative and supervisory personnel participation in our seminar sessions.

For some of the teachers, a rigid routine has developed and this cannot be changed overnight by some outsiders coming in and saying that this or that should be done. As in most cases, a pat on the back goes much farther than a kick in the pants and through encouragement of already sound educational practices, suggestions and help can be given to assist in those areas in the most need. Such a change does not come about from one or two contacts, but must be developed through cooperative action on a professional level. These people are being accepted as the educators they were trained to be. As a result of this acceptance, a different personal attitude can be noted. Where at one time they were hesitant to communicate much beyond a cordial greeting we now find a willingness on the part of teachers, administrators, and supervisors alike to express concern about specific teaching areas, admit to limitations and freely work with us toward the improvement of the total instructional program.

This gradual relaxation of career-long inhibitions has made them more keenly aware of the professional strengths they have--strengths that for too many years have gone unnoticed and undeveloped. Some appear now to genuinely look forward to the contact they have with the project members. In my view, the non-threatening approach to the projects' objectives has proven most successful.

It is not realistic to paint a completely negative or positive picture of the professional staff. Like all staffs, the full spectrum of interests and abilities are present. It is our hope that through the efforts of this project, an awareness has been kindled--an awareness that we hope will continue long after our initial contacts.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

J. Michael Palardy
Assistant Professor
University of Georgia

In order to set the stage for my remarks, I think it's important that I give you this brief background. I'm privileged to be working with 32 teachers in two Georgia school districts that are rural, are isolated, and are majority Negro. Twenty-one of the teachers are black; eleven white. With the exception of two black teachers in one of the districts, all of the black teachers are teaching all-black classes in all-black schools and all of the white teachers all-white classes in all-white schools. The 32 teachers constitute about 1/8th of the total professional staff in these two districts. Eight are engaged in this project for university credit (5 quarter hours); 24 are not. Whether there was or is any administrative pressure on these teachers to participate in the project is unknown to me. It's like wise unknown whether these 32 teachers are representative of the total teaching population.

I have worked to date a total of 13 days in each of these two districts. I've had occasion to confer at least once with each teacher outside his classroom environment dealing with instructional concerns and have observed for varying reasons and at their request about 20 of the teachers in classroom situations. Several of the teachers I've observed more than once. Based on these contacts plus the 13 seminars I've conducted, these, then, are my most vivid impressions of the instructional strengths and weaknesses of these teachers -- impressions gained, I must add, from little hard data and from few scientific analyses.

Phil Jackson's analysis or description of "The Way Teaching Is" will serve today as my instructional taxonomy. Jackson divides teaching, you'll recall, into two basic stages: the preactive and the interactive. First, the preactive involving principally the two tasks of planning and evaluating.

Preactive

Until this past summer, the great majority of the teachers, I feel certain, had not heard of behavioral objectives. Certainly, from an examination of representative lesson plans each teacher submitted to me early in the year, none at that time defined his objectives in any way even closely approximating behavioral terms. Frankly, I have not worked with any of the teachers in this area -- although I understand one of the teams is doing this.

The lesson plans I did examine, however, and the teaching I did see made it fairly obvious to me that some daily planning of lessons was taking place. For the most part, this planning seemed to be public-centered (that is, focused on the entire class) rather than privately centered (on one individual) or semi-privately centered (on a group of individuals within the class). This has been an area in which I have been attempting to work, both directly and indirectly, both on a large scale and individually. It seems to me that progress is being made here, at least at the preactive stage. In other words, the teachers seem to be more consciously aware today that they should take into account individual and group differences and that they cannot expect success from a plan that doesn't take them into account. As far as the translation of this awareness into actual implementation during the interactive stage is concerned, this is much less obvious, even to the biased observer that I suspect I am.

I think three other basic points about the teachers' planning need to be made. First, I think the teachers' short-term planning is relatively good in contrast to their long-range planning. None of the teachers with whom I had originally talked was able to conceptualize expected learning outcomes much beyond the immediate duration of a given lesson. Cooperative teacher planning, of both a vertical and horizontal nature, was to the best of my knowledge not being done. The textbook was and is, for all practical purposes, the curriculum guide. My admonitions and protestations to the contrary seemed to me initially to be having some positive impact, but the effort did seem to peak almost as rapidly as it was begun. The best I can report to you today is that the seeds of doubt may have been planted.

A second point about planning is that it was being done - almost exclusively - for cognitive purposes. Now, I can say that the affective factor is creeping in, maybe not into formal planning _per se_, but at least it is being thought about. Whether what Johnny does in reading, for example, is more important than what reading does to Johnny has become a vocal concern. Incidentally, I do think that for many of the teachers the affective factor had been for some time a dormant concern - albeit one they had not quite been able to come to grips with.

Another dormant concern that is now beginning to be vocalized, and this is the last point about planning, is planning for relevance. The curriculum as presented in the textbooks and consequently packaged in most of these classrooms is in many respects irrelevant to the needs and interests of rural, disadvantaged students. It's a middle-class curriculum, it's an urban curriculum, it's a white curriculum, it's in many respects a college-prep curriculum. The teachers are conscious of this now, I think, and while none of us has proposed any major curricular revisions, the problem of relevance is now haunting us - openly.

I'd like to shift gears now and spend a few minutes giving you my impressions of the instructional strengths and weaknesses in the second major task in the preactive stage of teaching - the task of evaluation. I've categorized my remarks into program evaluation, pupil evaluation, and self-evaluation.

Very simply, I have seen little formal attempt on the part of the teachers, either individually or collectively, to evaluate the school's curricular program or the individual classroom's program. I have gotten the message from several of the teachers, who expressed misgivings about the new math and about ability grouping, that they believe program evaluation is not their prerogative. At this point, the teachers do not appear militant enough to demand participation in program evaluation. Indeed, I'm not so sure they would want the additional responsibility nor am I certain they have the training for it.

Pupil evaluation, as contrasted with program evaluation, was and is even more today I think, a strength. Although, for example, I have not made any formal comparisons of the six-week's grades the students are assigned, nor have the teachers except in one case volunteered this information, I feel rather certain from the way they are talking that they are becoming more and more aware of the deleterious effects of failure. In the one case in which a teacher did show me a comparison of her grades for two six-week periods, there was a difference and it was positive. At the end of the year when data on the retention rate was gathered, I'd be very surprised if it is not markedly lower than last year's. If the rate is lower, however, I would attribute it less to an attempt to honor individual differences than to a realization that there is an alternative to retention.

As far as testing is concerned, an examination of teacher-made tests submitted to me by each teacher at the beginning of the year revealed that they were all objective in nature and that they generally called for basic recall at the facts and information level of cognition. Few individual questions and no test as a whole went beyond this. This is an area, too, in which I think the teachers are beginning to increase their strength. As an example, several have shared with me self-made tests of a subjective nature. While I can't say yet that productive thinking, critical thinking, problem solving, or some of the other higher cognitive processes are called for on these tests, there does seem to be some progression in that direction. At the end of the year, when I collect another set of tests, I'll be able to determine a little better the extent of that progression.

In regard to self-evaluation, I found that most of the teachers initially were not either psychologically ready or fundamentally equipped with the prerequisite skills to evaluate their efforts in any critical way. Knowing what little I do about defense mechanisms I suspect I should not have been, but I have to admit that I was amazed at first at the willingness, indeed at the insistence of the teachers, to attribute to causes other than their own the obvious limitations in the curricular and instructional programs. The most frequently mentioned of these causes, as I heard them and as you might suspect, were the lack of instructional materials and facilities and the "poor academic status" of most of the students by the time they entered any given classroom. The culpability for students' inadequate achievement and maladjustment was seldom other than other-directed.

I am hopeful that most of the teachers, and I am fairly certain that some of them, are psychologically ready now to begin to look rather seriously at the one factor they had been less than anxious to examine before - their own teaching, their own pedagogical strategies, attitudes, values, and beliefs. Obviously, this is a critical stage - in my opinion, the most important one if any long range goal of continuous instructional improvement is to be realized. Again, in my opinion, this psychological readiness is prerequisite to the effective utilization of the specific analytical tools of instruction (Flanders, for example) and it is for this reason that I've not followed up on the excellent introduction to the Flanders method that the teachers were given during the summer workshop.

Interactive

At this point, I'd like to begin commenting on the interactive stage by describing my impressions of the classroom setting. The classrooms I visited, both for observation and demonstration purposes, at best were clean and drab and at worst were filthy and drab. None of the classrooms in the three schools in which I did 95% of my work, for example, had attractive bulletin boards or displays. I didn't notice during my observations a single teacher using mechanical A-V hardware of any type, nor did I see any hardware lying unused in these classrooms - not even so much as a record player. None of the elementary classrooms had a science corner or a reading corner, and some even had no apparent place for group work. None was self-contained.

In one of the schools the decibel level is so high that it was impossible without considerable effort on my part either to hear or to be heard. For the students in this environment not to "turn off" or "tune out" requires in my estimation an almost superhuman effort. And in another of the schools, the dust and dirt that permeats the atmosphere would give air conservationists and lung specialists additional and valid cause for alarm.

Despite these negative ecological factors, I sensed that within the classrooms themselves the teachers generally had established a rather relaxed atmosphere, although certainly not an informal one. There were some good attempts at humor and, particularly noticeable before and after the formal presentation of lessons, there were indications that the teachers and students had a mutual regard, if not respect, for each other. Unquestionably, in my opinion, these teachers by the very position they hold are fulfilling relatively well their role as models for behavior.

As you probably suspect, from what I've said earlier, actual classroom instruction is very traditional. A variety of teaching strategies is not employed. The presentation of facts and their regurgitation is the name of the game played. Individual and group differences cry out for attention but receive little. The old saying that "the teacher's role is to know and show and the student's role to sit and git" perhaps best characterizes most instruction. But even this saying is erroneous to the extent that many of the teachers seem to have a very inadequate or, at best, outdated grasp of their own subject matter fields. And finally, the students who have sat and got for so long can be found generally in one of three camps: at the one extreme, there are the passive learners; at the other extreme, the psychological dropouts; and in between, the apathetics.

Conclusion

Before turning this over to two other members of the team I would like to describe briefly for you the format of the seminars I hold every other week or so in my two districts. These seminars represent the only chance I have of meeting the teachers as a total group and, very frankly, of seeing some of the teachers at all since I only visit individual classrooms upon request. So the seminars are, really at the heart of my efforts, and for this reason I think you ought to be apprised of what they're like. I certainly don't intend to describe them in any detail, nor do I want you to think that I think they're in any way unique.

The seminars are held after school in an open and integrated setting. By open, I mean that other teachers in the district besides the ones who attended the summer conference are invited to attend if they desire. The topics for each seminar are known beforehand and can be disseminated from teacher to teacher. I've been surprised in one district to find non-conference teachers attend these seminars occasionally, and even more surprised to see some come back. By an integrated setting, I mean that in the one district that has both black and white participants, we all meet as a group. This in itself was no small accomplishment, and has been very beneficial.

We usually begin the seminars by considering the "think assignment" that I gave the participants the time before. Then the topic for the day is presented. Many of these were selected by the teachers themselves and do run the gamut of curricular and instructional concerns. The next time, for example, in one of the districts the topic is "the peer group" and that will be followed by "parent-teacher relationships." The presentation that I make is, hopefully, the antithesis of what I've been doing today. I try to keep it, in other words, as informal and indirect as possible. This, then, is often followed up by small group work, but always by a kind of brainstorming session. I usually conclude by giving the teachers a "think assignment" that relates to the topic of the day and that is designed to help them focus in on their individual situations.

I think what I'm happiest about, to this point, is that these seminars as planned or anticipated are increasingly becoming different from the seminars had. The teachers are becoming more responsive, more incisive, and more individualistic regarding the implications of these topics for their own pedagogical efforts.

Now, as I promised you, I am going to turn this over to two members of the team whom you have already met, Mr. Bruce Gordon and Mr. Jerry Lentini. Since each of them has been working with teachers in districts other than mine, I've asked them to give a brief description of their perceptions of the instructional strengths and weaknesses of the teachers they've been working with. Specifically, I've asked them to react to any similarities and/or differences between what I've reported as seeing and what they are finding with another sample.

....

Time for Gordon and Lentini

Admittedly, what the three of us have presented today regarding instructional strengths and weaknesses is far from an ideal picture. I do not think it has to be remembered, though, that it was a picture painted by three individuals who, in fact, have no basis except by implication for comparing what is today in these school districts with what was even as long ago as last year.

I think, however, progress this year has been made - in my opinion, in one fundamental area. I think the teachers, many if not most of them, have developed now the psychological readiness to question, to question what they're doing and why they're doing it. Obviously, these questions have already demanded some answers, some alternatives. Increasingly, if that psychological set is to be maintained and if the progress at the preactive stage is to be transferred to implementation at the interactive stage, more answers, more alternatives, more direction will need to be given.

For my part, I can think of no better concluding statement than to say that just as the task has only begun, so hopefully the effort is just beginning.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Bruce Gordon
Graduate Assistant
University of Georgia

My comments here are based entirely on what I have observed and done in the school and must be understood as being derived from this single source. Each of us has our own personal strengths and preferences when it comes to the total instructional program. Two areas of particular interest on my part are physical education and language arts.

For the most part, the elementary schools in these rural areas are without any physical education program. There are no physical education stations in these elementary schools, nor is a full or part-time physical education teacher made available for work in the students' classrooms or outside. At the junior and senior high level, varying programs in physical education are offered; but here, too, they are insufficient.

Time is allotted for a physical education period, but at the four schools (all black) in which I have been working nothing in the way of a formal program has been attempted. The reasons for this are three fold.

1. Indoor facilities are either non-existant or inadequate for the needs of the school.

2. Equipment is lacking for the most simple of activities. In one elementary school with ten classrooms I suggested to the principal that it might be beneficial to pool all the equipment they had and keep it in a central location for all the teachers to use. The result of this was five baseball bats in a total of eleven pieces; one baseball so out of shape that it could not roll anymore; two

footballs without blatters; two kickballs--one that held air and another that had a slow leak. If they ever needed to inflate any of the balls they had it was not possible because they had neither a pump nor needle to do it with.

3. The teachers, in general, have not had any special training in planning, organizing and carrying out a physical education program. It should be noted that system-wide guides are supplied to each school and are available to all the teachers. Suggested activities at each grade level are indicated.

I do not want you to believe that there is no time allowed for physical activities in these schools, but the activities they do have are of an undirected nature. The idea of a sequentially developed program designed to meet the needs of children at their level of maturation is no where to be seen. I have worked and am continuing to work with classroom teachers to help them direct their thinking toward the consideration of more planned group activities based on the physical needs of the children. To date, I have introduced some of the most elementary activities with the students. Like children anywhere, they have quickly adapted to these directed activities and the teaching staff now appears to be showing increased interest in this type of program.

The language arts program is almost completely textbook-oriented. One objective in my contact with teachers in this area was to have them become familiar with some of the many classroom language arts activities that require more than a repetition of what is stated in the text. In two of the junior high schools we visited, two teachers indicated interest in doing something with an original class play. Such an undertaking requires considerable time and effort on the part of both students and teachers. Yet, with this type of project, some children are getting the chance to create and perform something of their own for the first time. Of equal importance, they are learning by doing.

Because this was a first-time endeavor, we worked closely with the teachers and students to supply them with any assistance that they might need. The final product of this undertaking is not the production that they will perform for students and family, but is going to be the feeling of self-accomplishment that the children will experience. For the teachers, hopefully, it is just a start in the development of a program designed to more closely match the needs of the students under their guidance.

TYPES OF QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS THAT PROJECT TEACHERS HAVE MADE OF ME

Gerard F. Lentini
Graduate Assistant
University of Georgia

Dr. Palardy's presentation of instructional strengths and weaknesses of the teachers that he has been working with sounds familiar to me. For the first three months of this school year I worked in five county systems with teachers who were enrolled in the project. During this past quarter I requested to be limited to just two school systems because of academic requirements on the campus. The number of teachers in the project from the five county systems is somewhere between fifty and sixty.

My purpose for stating the approximate number of teachers is an attempt to show the relationship between the number of possible contacts which might have been made and the total number of teacher-consultant contacts which were actually made. Of the total number of teachers, I have worked directly with all of them at one time or another during the afternoon seminars which Dr. Bruce and I have conducted. As a consultant in reading and language arts I have worked with a total of twelve teachers. The exact nature of my consultant work varied from relatively broad requests to very specific requests. On the whole, the majority of teachers were indifferent to my being on the scene and made no use of my services.

In an extremely general way I would like to classify the types of requests and questions that project teachers have made of me while I was in their schools. As a framework for doing this I wish to use a classification scheme which was developed by the staff of the Eastern Regional Institute for Education, better known as ERIE. At sometime during this convention, their study will be presented.

I will introduce a category, define it, and then relate it to my work. I hope in this way to avoid confusion as to what each category means.

Educating - Queries related to subject content, learning psychology, teaching methodology, and curriculum modification

A total of five teachers have made requests or have asked questions in the areas of presenting a handwriting lesson to a group of second graders, presenting all of the listening skills to a group of first graders, teaching long and short vowel sounds to a group of second graders, and how to group children for effective reading instruction.

Demonstrating - Requests for consultant to personally perform or demonstrate in the presence of the teacher

A total of nine teachers have made requests for me to demonstrate how to teach a lesson from a basal reader to a group, teach any listening skill to the class, teach a lesson in creative writing, use the informal reading inventory and find the instructional reading levels of a group of slow readers, and read a library book to the class.

The latter request for reading to the class came after the teachers were made aware of the fact that we were willing to perform this function. We were in hopes that we might reach teachers who did not perform this pleasing part of teaching in their classrooms.

Evaluating and Reassuring - Queries or requests whereby consultant must judge quality of teaching, learning, progress, curriculum

Six teachers have allowed me to visit and observe their teaching. In all cases teachers were reluctant to share their objectives with me before the lesson so that I might have a basis upon which to make judgements. At no time was provision made for the teacher and myself to have a time alone for consultation and the making of follow up plans. This had to be done in the classroom while the children were assigned some type of seat work which would keep them busy.

Disseminating - Dissemination questions involving discussion of the project outside the seminar and all queries relative to days of school visitation

In order to make social conversation the question of time for the next seminar was brought up by most of the teachers with whom I have had contact.

Legitimatizing - Requests for illegal approval or unmerited approval

On three separate occasions one teacher has told me that she was unable to teach reading in groups because she didn't have the teachers manuals. This person had a masters degree from a well known university in the northeast. Three other teachers shared the idea with me that the low mental abilities and low reading levels of the children were hampering them from doing an effective job of teaching their grade levels to children.

Obfuscating - Questions designed to beat around the bush and avoid orientation to the task at hand

During the times when teachers invited me to evaluate their teaching there were four occasions where, during the follow-up consultation period teachers tried to get off the subject and talk about other things.

Rejecting - Questions loaded with hostility to consultant, curriculum, or project

For part of our afternoon seminars we used the SRA Teaching Problems Laboratory, a simulated experience in elementary teaching. As we sought to solve problems which were raised during the simulated experience several teachers reacted negatively to ideas such as: differentiation of homework assignments which met needs of students; reporting pupil progress in ways other than percentages and letter grades; and differentiating expectations of achievement because children are individuals. These teachers were reacting from philosophies which embrace ideas such as: every child must meet class standards in order to progress to the next grade level; children must be compared with each other and compete with each other to promote "healthy" competition. This is needed if they are to get along in the world beyond school. Failure is good, it will make the child try harder next time.

Socializing - Social questions like "Where did the principal get that darling orange mini-skirt?"

The teachers with whom I have made contact in the classroom are very willing to engage in social conversation with me. There have been several other teachers who are willing to sit and talk, but generally teachers have avoided contact in the halls and cafeteria, the places where I might see them.

Abstaining - Absence of any questions or requests during a consultant-teacher encounter

Although I come in contact with the teachers during the seminars and within the school buildings, I have worked directly with twelve out of the total. It has been our policy not to force any teacher to have us in. Time after time we have reinforced this idea with the teachers. Still, they have abstained.

I'll make several observations as to why I feel that teacher abstinence exists:

1. Supervision and consultation on a frequent basis has not been available to these teachers before
2. When supervision reached these teachers in the past it was of the threatening, inspection type rather than the helper variety
3. Some teachers really don't know what they should be asking for

An example of this comes from an experience which Dr. Bruce and I had in one school. We were visiting with the principal and during the course of our conversation it was mentioned that we had not had any requests in that school. We made it clear that we were not soliciting the aid of the principal to get us some requests. However, that afternoon I had four requests from teachers in that building. One of these broad requests was for me to come and teach the class all about long and short vowel sounds and all about long and short consonants. To fulfil this request would take me much longer than one visit, and I doubt if I'd ever be able to teach long and short consonants.

4. An intuitive feeling which I have is that some teachers are suspicious because suddenly, after many years of being ignored and doing for themselves, some white people from the University of Georgia are interested in them. It's possible that they feel that we are exploiting them in order to be funded in a federal project.

At this point you may feel that I have a negative point of view about the teachers and about our project. On the contrary, I feel that we have made some very good accomplishments when I consider where these teachers are and how far some of them have come. It's true that they are not on the same levels of proficiency in teaching that we see in our suburban, white, residential areas. We have to measure teacher progress in very small steps. Just as we say about children in the classroom, teachers are individuals with individual differences. We find them at certain levels of proficiency and help them to move to higher levels. If we had all children without problems, there would be no need for teachers. If we had all teachers without problems, there would be no need for supervision, nor for projects like ours.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS OF THE RURAL DISADVANTAGED

Ray E. Bruce
Associate Professor
University of Georgia

You have heard described our current project which began last summer, 1969, but our close association with teachers of the rural disadvantaged actually began in June, 1968, approximately twenty-two months ago. John Reynolds has indicated to you that we responded during late spring of 1968 to a request from the Rural Isolated Task Force (Richard L. Fairley, now acting director of the Division of Compensatory Education, USOE, was head of this semi-official group) in the U. S. Office of Education to plan and carry out, on the University of Georgia campus, an institute program for teachers from the county school systems studied in the "Six School System Study" (reported in "A Summary Report of Six School Systems, University of Miami, 1968). The institute was to be held during the summer of 1968. We reacted to that request in an enthusiastic but, I am afraid, all too traditional manner.

As we made plans for working with the 179 teachers who would be participants in that summer program we explored what we felt were all the exciting possibilities at our disposal. But our vision at that time did not extend beyond the consideration of what could be done on the university campus and within the summer session time period. So accustomed were we to thinking in very traditional ways about college offerings and so comfortable were we in our teaching in the college center that we did not explore other alternatives.

We planned a summer program for 1968 which was sound, meaningful, and even exciting to those of us on the university campus. The teacher participants reacted in ways we had predicted. They were stimulated by the interchange with college faculty members and with teachers from other school systems and other states. They were pleased--some were even flattered--by the quantity and quality of association with college personnel. At the end of the summer and following the array of experiences planned for them teacher participants registered a significant positive shift in attitude toward self, and they demonstrated achievement in cognitive areas.

As these participants left the summer institute to return to their homes and their final preparations for the opening of school in the fall of 1968 the tone seemed right for important changes in the teaching of the disadvantaged. Members of our 1968 summer staff reasoned that even if these teachers could not affect in a substantial way the system-wide teaching emphases in their local communities, certainly they could and would create an improved atmosphere for learning in their individual classrooms. The team was ready, we felt; there was only the game remaining.

Unfortunately, however, we failed to anticipate the need for reinforcement for these teachers once they were again in their classrooms and subject only to the influences which had always been present. Left on their own they tended to respond to their classroom challenges as they always had. The activities of the institute they had attended at the University of Georgia during the summer of 1968 remained, for all too many participants, just that, activities of the summer institute, albeit pleasant and immediately rewarding.

That experience of 1968 led us to determine that if we were again privileged to work with teachers of the rural disadvantaged we would:

1. Move our program away from the college campus and into the school setting of the participants.
2. Extend the period of our direct involvement with participants to include at least the full teaching year.
3. Schedule activities which would encourage teacher participants to use our team members in direct personal support to them as they worked in their individual classrooms.

As you now know the opportunity for us to work with teachers of the rural disadvantaged did come again. You have heard that program described in considerable detail, and it incorporates in central position the elements I have just listed. We have moved the program off the college campus and into local school settings. We have extended the time period to include the full teaching year. We have developed a host of highly individualized short and long term activities for use by team members in support of teachers in the classroom.

Our program is still in progress. This time next week our team members whom you have now met will be back in the schools and classrooms of the teachers we serve in the rural areas of central and southern Georgia. These teachers we serve are plagued by too little instructional supervision, too little time spent in in-service activity, too little money, too little community support (or even acceptance), and too little professional preparation too long ago. The effects of these conditions have massed to induce at least three reactions: (1) suspicion--in some cases fear--of the motives of those who now, at long last, offer help; (2) complacency and apathy concerning school improvement; and (3) resistance to change.

The professional isolation of those who teach the rural disadvantaged is extreme. This isolation, we submit, generates, over time, problems out of all proportion to the number of teachers involved. Some have asserted, sometimes with more feeling than fact, that ghetto problems in our major cities today are the results of the influx in recent years of poorly educated citizens who are either directly from rural areas, mostly in the South, or one generation out of those areas. To whatever degree we are willing to accept that assertion to that degree we must recognize the need to address the problem at its root source. We must concern ourselves seriously and continuously with the needs of the rural disadvantaged. The concern of our team members is for that array of their needs termed "educational" and most particularly with the need to involve those who teach the rural disadvantaged as fully participating and responsible members of the profession.

You have heard members of our team suggest that time was needed with our teacher participants to establish trust, communication, and conditions for professional growth. This has been a slow process for us--this process is not completed--but we are encouraged by the number of teachers who now relate to us as fellow professionals. We feel we are now to the point where many teachers are willing--and a few may even be eager--to open their classroom doors to their colleagues and to begin to look together at classroom and school-wide instructional and curriculum needs. We are distressed that, just at this critical point, we must say to these colleagues in the rural schools that the help we promised will not be available after June 30. Officials administering the Education Professions Development Act have reacted, as we all must, to problems of budget and the press of numbers. They have reordered their priorities. The Rural Isolated Project will not be supported by them for the coming year. Our university and eight others across the South are currently involved in this effort. If we are to continue in service to the teachers of the rural disadvantaged other sources of support must be found. With varying degrees of success the teams from the nine universities have sought to build bridges to the teachers. These bridges are built and remain open at this point, but the experience of our team suggests that even a short term neglect of maintenance will render the bridges impassable. We feel that the needs of the teachers of the rural disadvantaged deserve a high priority in the concerns of us all.

You may have marked us all as a band of missionaries. We confess with some pride to that, but we hope you will not dismiss us as rash evangelists without examining our total experience. However we may have influenced you concerning the needs of our fellow professionals in the rural areas we hope you see beyond that to the in-service model which has been ours. We have found for ourselves a new and highly rewarding relationship between college and public school. We have taken the program to the consumer. We are convinced that this is at least one necessary dimension of continued staff development for the total profession. We commend it to you.

APPENDIX B

FORMAL DEVICES USED IN EVALUATION

1. Tennessee Self Concept Scale
2. Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
3. Measures of Attitudes (by Semantic Differential)
4. Objectives of Programs for the Disadvantaged
5. Program Practices for Disadvantaged Children

TENNESSEE

(Department of Mental Health)

SELF CONCEPT SCALE

by

William H. Fitts, PhD.

Published by
Counselor Recordings and Tests
Box 6184 - Acklen Station Nashville, Tennessee 37212

INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill these boxes in later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked time started and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked time finished.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

© William H. Fitts, 1964

	Item No.
1. I have a healthy body	1
3. I am an attractive person	3
5. I consider myself a sloppy person	5
19. I am a decent sort of person	19
21. I am an honest person	21
23. I am a bad person	23
37. I am a cheerful person	37
39. I am a calm and easy going person	39
41. I am a nobody	41
55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble	55
57. I am a member of a happy family	57
59. My friends have no confidence in me	59
73. I am a friendly person	73
75. I am popular with men	75
77. I am not interested in what other people do	77
91. I do not always tell the truth	91
93. I get angry sometimes	93

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

	Item No.
2. I like to look nice and neat all the time	2
4. I am full of aches and pains	4
6. I am a sick person	6
20. I am a religious person	20
22. I am a moral failure	22
24. I am a morally weak person	24
38. I have a lot of self-control	38
40. I am a hateful person	40
42. I am losing my mind	42
56. I am an important person to my friends and family	56
58. I am not loved by my family	58
60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me	60
74. I am popular with women	74
76. I am mad at the whole world	76
78. I am hard to be friendly with	78
92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about	92
94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross	94

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

Item No.

7. I am neither too fat nor too thin.. 7

9. I like my looks just the way they are.. 9

11. I would like to change some parts of my body.. 11

25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.. 25

27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God.. 27

29. I ought to go to church more.. 29

43. I am satisfied to be just what I am.. 43

45. I am just as nice as I should be.. 45

47. I despise myself.. 47

61. I am satisfied with my family relationships.. 61

63. I understand my family as well as I should.. 63

65. I should trust my family more.. 65

79. I am as sociable as I want to be.. 79

81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.. 81

83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.. 83

95. I do not like everyone I know.. 95

97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.. 97

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

		Item No.
8.	I am neither too tall nor too short	8
10.	I don't feel as well as I should	10
12.	I should have more sex appeal	12
26.	I am as religious as I want to be	26
28.	I wish I could be more trustworthy	28
30.	I shouldn't tell so many lies	30
44.	I am as smart as I want to be	44
46.	I am not the person I would like to be	46
48.	I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do	48
62.	I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).	62
64.	I am too sensitive to things my family say	64
66.	I should love my family more	66
80.	I am satisfied with the way I treat other people	80
82.	I should be more polite to others	82
84.	I ought to get along better with other people	84
96.	I gossip a little at times	96
98.	At times I feel like swearing	98

Responses -	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

Item No.

13. I take good care of myself physically.................................. 13

15. I try to be careful about my appearance................................. 15

17. I often act like I am "all thumbs"...................................... 17

31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life............................ 31

33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong............. 33

35. I sometimes do very bad things.. 35

49. I can always take care of myself in any situation....................... 49

51. I take the blame for things without getting mad......................... 51

53. I do things without thinking about them first........................... 53

67. I try to play fair with my friends and family........................... 67

69. I take a real interest in my family..................................... 69

71. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living)......... 71

85. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.................... 85

87. I get along well with other people...................................... 87

89. I do not forgive others easily.. 89

99. I would rather win than lose in a game.................................. 99

Responses -	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

		Item No.
14.	I feel good most of the time	14
16.	I do poorly in sports and games	16
18.	I am a poor sleeper	18
32.	I do what is right most of the time	32
34.	I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead	34
36.	I have trouble doing the things that are right	36
50.	I solve my problems quite easily	50
52.	I change my mind a lot	52
54.	I try to run away from my problems	54
68.	I do my share of work at home	68
70.	I quarrel with my family	70
72.	I do not act like my family thinks I should	72
86.	I see good points in all the people I meet	86
88.	I do not feel at ease with other people	88
90.	I find it hard to talk with strangers	90
100.	Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today	100

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Marking Instructions

Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire:

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

Teachers call each other by their first names. 1 2 3 4

In this example the respondent marked alternative 3 to show that the inter-personal relationship described by this item "often occurs" at his school. Of course, any of the other alternatives could be selected, depending upon how often the behavior described by the item does, indeed, occur in your school.

Please mark your response clearly, as in the example. PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU MARK EVERY ITEM.

1. Rarely occurs.
2. Sometimes occurs.
3. Often occurs.
4. Very frequently occurs.

13. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school. 1 2 3 4

14. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying. 1 2 3 4

15. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems. 1 2 3 4

16. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available. 1 2 3 4

17. Teachers invite other faculty to visit them at home. 1 2 3 4

18. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority. 1 2 3 4

19. Extra books are available for classroom use. 1 2 3 4

20. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports. 1 2 3 4

21. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members. 1 2 3 4

22. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members. 1 2 3 4

23. In faculty meetings, there is a feeling of "let's get things done." 1 2 3 4

24. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school. 1 2 3 4

25. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members. 1 2 3 4

26. Teachers seek special favors from the principal. 1 2 3 4

27. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork. 1 2 3 4

28. Student progress reports require too much work. 1 2 3 4

29. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time. 1 2 3 4

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

30. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings. 1 2 3 4

31. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues. 1 2 3 4

32. Teachers have too many committee requirements. 1 2 3 4

33. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally. 1 2 3 4

34. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings. 1 2 3 4

35. Custodial service is available when needed. 1 2 3 4

36. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching. 1 2 3 4

37. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves. 1 2 3 4

38. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings. 1 2 3 4

39. Teachers at this school show much school spirit. 1 2 3 4

40. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers. 1 2 3 4

41. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems. 1 2 3 4

42. Teachers at this school stay by themselves. 1 2 3 4

43. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure. 1 2 3 4

44. The principal sets an example by working hard himself. 1 2 3 4

45. The principal does personal favors for teachers. 1 2 3 4

46. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms. 1 2 3 4

47. The morale of the teachers is high. 1 2 3 4

48. The principal uses constructive criticism. 1 2 3 4

49. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work. 1 2 3 4

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occur

50. Teachers socialize together in small select groups. 1 2 3 4

51. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions. 1 2 3 4

52. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day. 1 2 3 4

53. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions. 1 2 3 4

54. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences. 1 2 3 4

55. The principal schedules the work for the teachers. 1 2 3 4

56. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day. 1 2 3 4

57. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member. 1 2 3 4

58. Teachers help select which courses will be taught. 1 2 3 4

59. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes. 1 2 3 4

60. The principal talks a great deal. 1 2 3 4

61. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers. 1 2 3 4

62. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers. 1 2 3 4

63. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously. 1 2 3 4

64. The rules set by the principal are never questioned. 1 2 3 4

65. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers. 1 2 3 4

66. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use. 1 2 3 4

67. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference. 1 2 3 4

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Frequently occurs

68.	The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.	1	2	3	4
69.	Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.	1	2	3	4
70.	Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.	1	2	3	4
71.	Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.	1	2	3	4
72.	The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.	1	2	3	4
73.	Teachers talk about leaving the school system.	1	2	3	4
74.	The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.	1	2	3	4
75.	The principal is easy to understand.	1	2	3	4
76.	Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.	1	2	3	4
77.	Grading practices are standardized at this school.	1	2	3	4
78.	The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.	1	2	3	4

79. My husband/wife teaches in this school system.
    1. Yes.
    2. No.
    3. Not applicable.

80. I will be leaving this school system in June.
    1. Yes.
    2. No.

MEASURES OF ATTITUDES

In order that we can learn more about ourselves and our common problems, we would like to obtain, anonymously, information about various concepts. Please answer, also, the following biographical questions:

(1) SEX:

_____Male _____Female

(2) YEARS OF TEACHING:

_____1-3 _____4-6 _____7-9 _____10-12

_____13-15

(3) RACE:

_____Negro _____White _____Other

(4) YEARS OF POST HIGH SCHOOL FORMAL EDUCATION:

_____4 _____5 _____6 _____7 _____8

(5) IN WHAT STATE DID YOU ATTEND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL?

____

(6) FROM WHAT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION WERE YOU GRADUATED?

____

(7) WHAT DEGREE DO YOU HOLD?

____

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to find out how you feel about certain concepts. On the next page you will find a set of scales. You are to rate each concept on each of these scales.

Here is how you are to use the scales:

If you feel this In-Service Program is very much like one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

PLEASANT__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNPLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

or

PLEASANT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__UNPLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you feel this In-Service Program is quite closely like one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your checkmark as follows:

RUGGED _____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____DELICATE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

or

RUGGED _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____DELICATE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you feel this In-Service Program is only slightly like one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

SHARP _____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____DULL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

or

SHARP _____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____DULL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you feel this In-Service Program is neutral on the scale, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale best describes your feeling about each concept.

Do not worry or puzzle over any one scale. It is your first impression, your immediate feeling about each concept that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

Remember, you are judging the concept as you see it--not what we think or what your colleague thinks.

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries:

this   not this

_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____X_____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(2) Be sure to check every scale; do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

(THIS IN-SERVICE PROGRAM)

LARGE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	SMALL
UNPLEASANT	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PLEASANT
FAST	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	SLOW
DULL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	SHARP
THIN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	THICK
HAPPY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	SAD
WEAK	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	STRONG
GOOD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	BAD
MOVING	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	STILL
UNFAIR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	FAIR
PASSIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	ACTIVE
HEAVY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	LIGHT

(THE ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED CHILD)

LARGE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(MYSELF)

LARGE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(A NEGRO TEACHER)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(A WHITE TEACHER)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(NEGRO PRINCIPALS)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(WHITE PRINCIPALS)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(OTHER TEACHERS)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(A NEGRO CHILD)

LARGE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(A WHITE CHILD)

LARGE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SMALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNPLEASANT ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: PLEASANT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

FAST ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SLOW
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DULL ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SHARP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THIN ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: THICK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HAPPY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: SAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WEAK ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STRONG
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

GOOD ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: BAD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

MOVING ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: STILL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNFAIR ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: FAIR
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PASSIVE ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: ACTIVE
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

HEAVY ______:______:______:______:______:______:______: LIGHT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PART I

OBJECTIVES OF PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

INFORMATION FOR COMPLETING PART I

Listed below are objectives of programs for the disadvantaged; you are asked to rank them from one to sixteen. Rank number one should be assigned to the objective that in your opinion, if achieved with some success, would serve as a foundation for achieving remaining objectives. Ranks numbers two through fifteen should similarly be assigned according to the contribution of the objective, if met successfully, to the realization of remaining objectives. Rank number sixteen should then be assigned to the objective that in your opinion is most likely to be realized only after some success has been met in achieving the antecedent objectives.

OBJECTIVES	RANKS 1-16
1. To develop and utilize materials, curricula, school organizations, and teaching techniques suitable for the needs of the disadvantaged child.	
2. To improve the disadvantaged child's motivation to learn.	
3. To broaden the disadvantaged child's cultural and experiential background, (including preschool disadvantaged children).	
4. To increase the school's effectiveness in identification, diagnosis, and treatment of physical, psychological, and environmental problems of the disadvantaged child.	
5. To improve understanding among home, school, and community; to increase the disadvantaged parent's involvement in the education of his children and to increase the participation of the community in the operation of its schools.	
6. To reduce the number of school dropouts among disadvantaged youth.	
7. To provide the disadvantaged child with opportunities for success in school and to reduce his frustrations caused by repeated failures.	
8. To identify and evaluate the particular educational needs of the disadvantaged child.	
9. To improve the disadvantaged child's reading and other academic skills.	
10. To improve the overall scholastic performance of the disadvantaged child.	
11. To break the poverty cycle by preparing disadvantaged youth to be well-adjusted, self-sustaining, contributing members of American society.	
12. To improve professional understanding and acceptance of the disadvantaged child's characteristics, culture, and true educational potential.	
13. To increase the disadvantaged child's facility with the English language.	
14. To raise the level of aspiration of the disadvantaged child.	
15. To improve the self-concept of the disadvantaged child.	
16. To improve the disadvantaged child's social attitudes and behavior.	

PART II -- PROGRAM PRACTICES FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

INFORMATION FOR COMPLETING PART II

Listed below are practices to help disadvantaged children and youth. Please assign each practice a priority rating of from one to five according to the priority you would give it in developing programs for the disadvantaged. A rating of one is the highest priority.

	PRACTICES	PRIORITY RATINGS 1-5
1.	Individual and small group counseling for parents.	
2.	Extension of the school day and school week.	
3.	Utilization of parents in varying capacities to assist the schools.	
4.	Bussing, pairing schools, redistricting, or other methods to reduce racial imbalance in the schools.	
5.	Use of programmed materials.	
6.	Professional in-service education during the school year and during the summer.	
7.	Vocational programs and work-study opportunities for secondary school disadvantaged youth.	
8.	Tutoring and small group instruction.	
9.	Remedial programs in basic skills and subjects other than reading and language.	
10.	Professional assistance to the teacher by subject matter specialists.	
11.	Programs of adult education for disadvantaged parents.	
12.	Development and use of study centers, library centers, tutoring centers and cultural centers for the disadvantaged.	
13.	Remedial programs in reading and language.	
14.	Expanded use of audio-visual equipment.	
15.	Increased visitation opportunities in the schools for parents.	
16.	Professional assistance to the teacher by consultants who are experienced in working with the disadvantaged.	
17.	Non-graded school organizations.	
18.	Reduced class size.	
19.	Summer programs.	
20.	Increased kindergarten opportunities for the disadvantaged, and pre-school programs for three and four year old disadvantaged children.	
21.	Development and use of special educational material, readers and other textbooks, designed for and relevant to the lives and experiences of the disadvantaged.	
22.	Use of specialized supportive personnel, including: psychiatrists and psychologists; physicians, dentists, and nurses; speech and hearing specialists; social workers and non-professional home-school liaison persons; and guidance counselors.	
23.	Cultural activities and field trips.	
24.	Use of teacher aides in the school.	

APPENDIX C

1. Roster of Participants
2. Schedules for Summer Conferences
3. Summer Conference Evaluation Form--Sample
4. Problem Identification Sheet--Sample
5. Problem Identification Summary--by Counties
6. Illustrative Seminar Schedules

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

(For each of the 120 officially enrolled participants listed below the pre-program and post-program address is the same and is the address given at the beginning of each school system group.)

Dodge County Schools
Eastman Georgia 31023

1. Lee D. Boles	711 E. Orange St., Fitzgerald, Ga. 31750
2. Sydney J. Brown	P.O. Box 91, Eastman, Ga. 31023
3. Juanita B. Edwards	1006 Herman Ave., Eastman, Ga. 31023
4. Irvin A. Hamilton	504 3rd Ave., Eastman, Ga. 31023
5. Lucille C. Hamilton	Route 1, Box 157, Chauncey, Ga. 31011
6. Vernesteen Reaves	Route1, Box 73, Rhine, Ga. 31077
7. Mary L. Wilcox	P.O. Box 65, Rhine, Ga. 31077

Greene County Schools
Greensboro, Georgia 30642

1. Ulysses Bacon	P.O. Box 317, Union Point, Ga. 30669
2. Almeta D. Barnhart	P.O. Box 356, Greensboro. Ga. 30642
3. Vera D. Brown	108 Hunter St.,Union Point, Ga. 30669
4. Aranda M. Davis	P.O. Box 52, Union Point, Ga. 30669
5. Robert E. Edwards	Route 1, Box 72, Mayfield, Ga. 31059
6. Augusta C. Freeman	P.O. Box 30, Siloam, Ga. 30665
7. Eugene M. Graham	Box 236, Union Point, Ga. 30669
8. Johnnie L. Grant	1008 Dolvin Ave., Union Point, Ga. 30669
9. Lucile B. Hudson	Box 261, Greensboro, Ga. 30642
10. Eleanor J. Lewis	604 Woodland Court, Union Point, Ga. 30669
11. Gail E. Lumpkin	Route 1, Box 131, Union Point, Ga. 30669
12. Arthur Skrine	Route 3, Greensboro, Ga. 30642

Johnson County Schools
Wrightsville, Georgia 31096

1. Mary J. Stephens	Route 2, Box 92, Wrightsville, Ga. 31096

Macon County Schools
Oglethorpe, Georgia 31068

1. Lowell Centers	332 Marshall Ave., Montezuma, Ga. 31063
2. James D. Maffett, Jr.	Leon Avenue, Montezuma, Ga. 31063
3. Johnny R. Southwell	116 Walnut St., Montezuma, Ga. 31063
4. Nelle H. Sullivan	Route 1, Pinehurst, Ga. 31070

Monroe County Schools
Forsyth, Georgia 31029

1. Lois G. Bryant	370 Sunset Circle, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
2. Mary L. Cheney	Route 4, Box 115, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
3. Alice V. Cromer	Route 3, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
4. Rosemary K. Evans	Smarr, Georgia 31086
5. Doris V. Grant	Route 4, Box 100, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
6. Rosalyn W. Hall	Route 4, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
7. Jamie J. Ham	53 B Brooklyn Ave., Forsyth, Ga. 31029
8. Fannie B. Henderson	P.O. Box 445, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
9. Ruth W. Holloway	P.O. Box 358, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
10. Samuel E. Hubbard	P.O. Box 415, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
11. Ruth K. Johnson	P.O. Box 413, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
12. Opal C. Lancaster	Route 3, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
13. Annie N. Laster	Route 4, Box 21, Union Hill Dr., Forsyth, Ga. 31029
14. Clintonia S. Lovett	Route 4, Box 115, Forsyth, Georgia 31029
15. Adolph Parsons	347 Culloden Road, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
16. Eleanor K.Parsons	P.O. Box 413, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
17. Helen C. Porch	26 Mornside Drive, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
18. William Y. Querry	200 Indian Springs Dr., Forsyth, Ga. 31029
19. Ruth G. Smith	236 Union Hill Dr., P.O. Box 321,Forsyth,Ga. 31029
20 Elsie M. Wadley	Bolingbroke, Georgia 31004
21. Rubye J. Watts	P.O. Box 478, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
22. Annie Whitehead	Box 475, Forsyth, Ga. 31029

Pike County Schools
Zebulon, Georgia 30295

1. Bobbie B. Bates	P.O. Box 337, Meansville, Ga. 30256
2. May B. Brooks	P.O. Box 445, Molena, Ga. 30258
3. Margaret H. Campbell	Route 1, Meansville, Ga. 30256
4. Jean P. Copeland	Concord Street, Zebulon, Ga. 30295
5. Earlie M. Harper	2831 Marco Drive, N.W., Atlanta, Ga. 30318
6. Martha A. Kendall	Route 1, Box 453, Thomaston, Ga. 30286
7. Elma H. King	Route 1, Zebulon, Ga. 30295
8. Hazel B. Lee	Box 122, Concord, Ga. 30206
9. Dot C. McCombs	Box 131, Concord, Ga. 30206
10. Earline S. McDaniel	Route 1, Zebulon, Ga. 30295
11. Oscar Michael	P.O. Box 239, Meansville, Ga. 30256
12. Hazel L. Milby	P.O. Box 356, Meansville, Ga. 30256
13. Laura Parks	Route 6, Box 102, Oakdale Rd., Griffin, Ga. 30223
14. Eleanor L. Smith	Route 3, Box 87, Barnesville, Ga. 30204
15. Pat P. Strickland	Concord, Georgia 30206
16. Carolyn Whitehurst	Williamson, Ga. 30292
17. Connie M. Williams	Box 403, Molena, Ga. 30258
18. Ann J. Young	Box 327, Meansville, Ga. 30256

Schley County Schools
Ellaville, Georgia 31806

1. Versa E. Bryson	1117 N. Lee St., Americus, Ga. 31709
2. Clara M. Freeman	218 Forrest St., Americus, Ga. 31709
3. Sara B. Murphy	151 West Patterson St., Americus, Ga. 31709
4. Annie A. Rumph	1106 Benjamin St., Fort Valley, Ga. 31030
5. Alma G. Smith	727 N. Lee St., Americus, Ga. 31709
6. Nannie K. Smith	Box 269, Ellaville, Ga. 31806
7. Ozie L. Thompson	P.O. Box 215, Ellaville, Ga. 31806
8. Rosa G. Thompson	P.O. Box 403, Ellaville, Ga. 31806
9. Juanita G. Wade	P.O. Box 254, Ellaville, Ga. 31806

Sumter County Schools
Americus, Georgia 31709

1. Neasie J. Hill	305 Rucker St., Americus, Ga. 31709

Twiggs County Schools
Jeffersonville, Georgia 31044

1. Bettie M. Aaron	3371 Finneydale Drive, Macon, Ga. 31201
2. Avan T. Adams	P.O. Box 293, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
3. Annie C. Allen	Route4, Box 78, Forsyth, Ga. 31029
4. Elizabeth L. Ashley	Route 1, Box 15, Danville, Ga. 31017
5. James C. Basley	Route 1, Box 197, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
6. Juanita C. Brown	P.O. Box 163, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
7. Pearle H. Bryant	879 Ell Street, Macon, Ga. 31206
8. Rosa B. Clark	General Delivery, Dry Branch, Ga. 31020
9. Margaret W. Davis	Route 1, Box 24, Dry Branch, Ga. 31020
10. Barbara L. Dennard	P.O. Box 149, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
11. Rosa Eason	Route 1, Box 176 A, Dry Branch, Ga. 31020
12. Betty A. Ford	Route 1, Box 25, Talbotton, Ga. 31827
13. Mary L. Harmon	P.O. Box 209, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
14. Patricia A. Hubbard	490 Hall Street, Macon, Ga. 31201
15. Alma M. Ingram	3721 Crest Drive, Macon, Ga. 31201
16. Avis C. Jenkins	General Delivery, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
17. Earnest W. Lewis	P.O. Box 138, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
18. Mary C. Lewis	P.O. Box 138, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
19. Jessie M. Mack	Route 1, Box 65, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
20. Mattie M. Nelson	1315 Kitchens Street, Macon, Ga. 31201
21. Ada R. Parker	Route 1, Box 127, Dry Branch, Ga. 31020
22. Edward E. Robinson	Route 2, Box 124, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
23. Theodore D. Smith	4963 John Kennedy Drive, Macon, Ga. 31204
24. Annie D. Stewart	P.O. Box 105, Dry Branch, Ga. 31020
25. Mary L. Stewart	2349 Berthadale Ave., Macon, Ga. 31204
26. Winnie F. Wiley	Route 2, Box 124, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044
27. Betty J. Wilson	P.O. Box 99, Jeffersonville, Ga. 31044

Washington County Schools
Sandersville, Georgia 31082

1. Edward T. Averett	301 East Church St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
2. Rebecca D. Cason	Route 1, Warrenton, Ga. 30828
3. Doris W. Crawford	Route 4, Box 311, Sandersville, Ga. 31082
4. Corine M. Cuby	P.O. Box 1646, Davisboro, Ga. 31018
5. Martha M. Dean	P.O. Box 539. Sandersville, Ga. 31082
6. Nellie S. Herringdine	307 Washington Ave., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
7. Eloise F. Major	211 West Floyd St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
8. Eva K. Pinkston	Route 2, Box 148, Mitchell, Ga. 30820
9. Celia L. Reeves	Route 1, Box 125, Warthen, Ga. 30829
10. Donald R. Reeves	718 Evelyn Street, Sandersville, Ga. 31082
11. Lemmie F. Reeves	718 Evelyn Street, Sandersville, Ga. 31082
12. Gladys R. Robinson	509 West Haynes St., Sandersville, Ga.31082
13. Mary V. Smith	236 North Harris St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
14. Charles C. Twombly	223 North Harris St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
15. Rabun R. Waller	P.O. Box 26, Harrison Ga. 31035
16. Christine M. Wheeler	203 East McCarthy St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
17. Elmus W. Williams	416 East McCarthy St., Sandersville, Ga. 31082
18. Hattie M. Woods	Route 1, Box 424, Tennille, Ga. 31089
19. Lois P. Young	Route 2, Box 217, Tennille, Ga. 31089

1969-70 EPDA INSTITUTE

INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Department of Curriculum and Supervision
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Please place my name on your list of participants for this institute program. I understand that in this program I am obligated to attend a one-week (5-day) drive-in summer conference and 18 two-hour seminar sessions conducted in my own school system.

My position for the 1969-70 regular school year will be in the ____________________ School of the ____________________ School System.

I will be:

_____ a teacher in grade _____. My responsibilities will include teaching these subjects: ________________ ____.

_____ the principal

_____ a supervisor. Specialty: ______________________.

_____ Other (please explain) ______________________ ____.

I hold the following degrees:

Degree	Major Field	Minor Field	College Attended

Five hours graduate credit are available to those who wish to enroll on that basis. The course designation will be ECS 705--Problems of Teaching the Disadvantaged. The tuition charge for credit enrollment will be $75.00, payable during the one-week summer conference. For those who do not enroll for credit there will be no charge. Please check one of the following:

_____ I wish to enroll for credit.

_____ I DO NOT wish to enroll for credit.

Signature ______________________

Name (please print) ______________________

Home Mailing Address ______________________
____

Telephone Number ______________________

Signature of Superintendent or representative who approves this registration:

____
Name Title

University of Georgia

Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students

1969 - 1970

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

NAME ____ ___ Miss
(Last) (First) (MI) ___ Mrs.
___ Mr.

Home Address ____

____
(Zip Code)

Home Telephone Number ________________________________
(Area Code)

School System ______________________________________

My mailing address at school is:

____

____

My telephone number at school is ____________________________

Place of birth ____

Date of birth ____
(Month) (Day) (Year)

The high school from which I was graduated was located in __________

____

We had approximately __________ students in our graduating class.

I hold theses college degrees:

DEGREE	COLLEGE	LOCATION	YEAR OF AWARD	MAJOR FIELD	MINOR FIELD

I hold the ____________________ Certificate from the Georgia Department of Education.

I have taught in all schools ______________ years.

I have taught in THIS school system ______________ years.

I have taught in ______________ OTHER school systems. They are:

	NAME OF SYSTEM	LOCATION	YEARS OF SERVICE
1.			
2.			
3.			

Please state your reason(s) for participating in this institute program.

June 16, 1969

TO: Teacher, Principal and Supervisor Participants of the Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students

FROM: The Institute Staff

Dr. Ray E. Bruce, Director
Mrs. Shirlee D. Jefferson
Dr. Martin A. McCullough
Dr. J. Michael Palardy
Dr. John C. Reynolds, Jr.
Mr. Robert W. Selwa

We welcome you to our summer conference! We sincerely hope that our week together will be as exciting and valuable for you as has been the staff's time of preparation. Our staff members share your deep interest in and concern for all the children you teach and particularly for those who might appropriately be labeled "disadvantaged." We come to you in the hope that we can help you in your efforts with these children.

It will be our plan this week to create opportunities for you to refresh yourself concerning some old ideas and, hopefully, to explore some ideas that may be new to you. The ideas presented will be those we think important for those who do the all-important task of teaching in the classroom, and we will be seeking your judgments about these ideas. We hope you come to this conference sensing our respect for your judgment and your experience. We want your active participation in all the activities of the week--for your good, your neighbor's good, and for ours. We think there is much we can learn from each other.

To set the stage for our conference together we have selected some topics and have allotted blocks of time for considering them. Our thinking and discussion concerning each topic will be guided by one of the staff. Our pledge is to be flexible as we seek to meet the needs of the group so our schedule may change, but to get us started we offer the following:

Monday, June 16

8:30 - 9:45	Introduction	Bruce
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part I	McCullough and Staff

Monday, June 16(cont'd)

11:30 - 1:15	Lunch Conferences Films Directed Study	Staff
1:15 - 2:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part II	McCullough and Staff

Tuesday, June 17

8:30 - 9:45	Teacher Expectancy	Palardy
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Teaching Strategies	Reynolds and Jefferson
11:30 - 1:15	Lunch Conferences Films Directed Study	Staff
1:15 - 2:30	Current Curriculum Developments	Reynolds

Wednesday, June 18

8:30 - 9:45	Interaction Analysis, Part I	McCullough
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Interaction Analysis, Part II	McCullough
11:30 - 1:15	Lunch Conferences Films Directed Study REGISTRATION	Staff
1:15 - 2:30	Conference Evaluation and the Academic Year Focus	Bruce

Thursday, June 19

8:30 - 9:45	Meetings by Counties	Staff
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Meetings with Cross-County Groups	Staff
11:30 - 1:15	Lunch Conferences Films Directed Study	Staff
1:15 - 2:30	Instructional Media	Selwa

Friday, June 20

8:30 - 9:45	Meetings by Counties to Determine Year-long Focus	Staff
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	The Importance of the Self-Concept	Palardy
11:30 - 1:15	Lunch Conferences Films Directed Study	Staff
1:15 - 2:00	Literature Concerning the Disadvantaged	Palardy
2:00 - 2:30	Conclusion	Bruce

July 7, 1969

TO: Teacher, Principal, and Supervisor Participants of the Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students

FROM: The Institute Staff

Dr. Ray E. Bruce, Director
Mrs. Shirlee D. Jefferson
Dr. Martin A. McCullough
Dr. J. Michael Palardy
Dr. John C. Reynolds, Jr.
Mr. Robert W. Selwa

We welcome you to our summer conference! We sincerely hope that our week together will be as exciting and valuable for you as has been the staff's time of preparation. Our staff members share your deep interest in and concern for all the children you teach and particularly for those who might appropriately be labeled "disadvantaged." We come to you in the hope that we can help you in your efforts with these children.

It will be our plan this week to create opportunities for you to refresh yourself concerning some old ideas and, hopefully, to explore some ideas that may be new to you. The ideas presented will be those we think important for those who do the all-important task of teaching in the classroom, and we will be seeking your judgments about these ideas. We hope you come to this conference sensing our respect for your judgment and your experience. We want your active participation in all the activities of the week--for your good, for your neighbor's good, and for ours. We think there is much we can learn from each other.

To set the stage for our conference together we have selected some topics and have allotted blocks of time for considering them. Our thinking and discussion concerning each topic will be guided by one of the staff. Our pledge is to be flexible as we seek to meet the needs of the group. Our schedule may change, therefore, but to get us started we offer the following:

Monday, July 7

8:30 - 9:30	Introduction and Orientation	McCullough
9:30 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part I	McCullough

Monday, July 7 (cont'd)

11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part II	Reynolds
1:30 - 1:45	Break	
1:45 - 2:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part III	McCullough
2:30 - 3:00	Literature Concerning the Disadvantaged	Jefferson

Tuesday, July 8

8:30 - 9:45	Teacher Expectancy	Palardy
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Use of Media in Teaching the Disadvantaged	Selwa
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:45	Critical Moments in Teaching	Staff
1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Compensatory Programs in Education	Mr. George Trotter USOE

Wednesday, July 9

8:30 - 9:45	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part I	McCullough
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part II	McCullough
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch and Registration	
12:30 - 1:45	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part III	McCullough

Wednesday, July 9 (cont'd)

1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Group Meetings by Counties	Bruce and Staff

Thursday, July 10

8:30 - 9:45	Importance of the Self-Concept	Palardy
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Teaching Strategies	Jefferson
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:45	Early Childhood Among the Disadvantaged, Part I	Dr. Keith Osborn University of Georgia
1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Early Childhood Among the Disadvantaged, Part II	Osborn

Friday, July 11

8:30 - 9:30	Current Curriculum Developments for the Disadvantaged	Bruce
9:30 - 9:45	Break	
9:45 - 10:45	Consideration of Problem Focus for the Coming Year	Palardy
10:45 - 11:00	Break	
11:00 - 12:00	Staff Panel and Conclusion	Staff

MONTEZUMA CONFERENCE

July 21, 1969

TO: Teacher, Principal, and Supervisor Participants of the Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students

FROM: The Institute Staff

Dr. Ray E. Bruce, Director
Mrs. Shirlee D. Jefferson
Dr. Martin A. McCullough
Dr. J. Michael Palardy
Dr. John C. Reynolds
Mr. Robert W. Selwa

We welcome you to our summer conference! We sincerely hope that our week together will be as exciting and valuable for you as has been the staff's time of preparation. Our staff members share your deep interest in and concern for all the children you teach and particularly for those who might appropriately be labeled "disadvantaged." We come to you in the hope that we can help you in your efforts with these children.

It will be our plan this week to create opportunities for you to refresh yourself concerning some old ideas and, hopefully, to explore some ideas that may be new to you. The ideas presented will be those we think importnat for you who do the all-important task of teaching in the classroom, and we will be seeking your judgments about these ideas. We hope you come to this conference sensing our respect for your judgment and your experience. We want your active participation in all the activities of the week--for your good, for your neighbor's good, and for ours. We think there is much we can learn from each other.

To set the stage for our conference together we have selected some topics and have allotted blocks of time for considering them. Our thinking and discussion concerning each topic will be guided by one of the staff. Our pledge is to be flexible as we seek to meet the needs of the group. Our schedule may change, therefore, but to get us started we offer the following:

Monday, July 21

8:30 - 9:30	Introduction and Orientation	Bruce and Staff
9:30 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part I	McCullough

Monday, July 21 (cont'd)

11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:30	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part II	Reynolds
1:30 - 1:45	Break	
1:45 - 2:15	Film: Portrait of a Disadvantaged Child, Tommy Knight	Reynolds
2:15 - 3:00	Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part III	McCullough

Tuesday, July 22

8:30 - 9:45	Teacher Expectancy	Palardy
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Use of Media in Teaching the Disadvantaged	Selwa
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:00	Literature Concerning the Disadvantaged	Jefferson
1:00 - 1:45	Critical Moments in Teaching	Staff
1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part I	McCullough

Wednesday, July 23

8:30 - 9:45	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part II	McCullough
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Interaction Analysis (IA), Part III	McCullough
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch and Registration	

Wednesday, July 23 (cont'd)

12:30 - 1:45	Consideration of Problem Focus on the Coming Year (Group meetings by counties)	Bruce and Staff
1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Critical Moments in Teaching	Staff

Thursday, July 24

8:30 - 9:45	Teaching Strategies	Jefferson
9:45 - 10:15	Break	
10:15 - 11:30	Importance of the Self-Concept	Palardy
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch	
12:30 - 1:45	Current Curriculum Developments for the Disadvantaged	Reynolds and Bruce
1:45 - 2:00	Break	
2:00 - 3:00	Critical Moments in Teaching	McCullough and Selwa

Friday, July 25

8:30 - 9:30	Educational Objectives and Evaluation	Bruce
9:30 - 9:45	Break	
9:45 - 10:45	Consideration of Problem Focus for the Coming Year	Staff
10:45 - 11:00	Break	
11:00 - 12:00	Staff Panel and Conclusion	Staff

INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

MONTEZUMA CONFERENCE July 21-25

Please rate each of the following program elements conducted during the past five days in terms of their value to you personally.

	of much value to me	of some value to me	of little value to me	I was not present
1. Introduction and Orientation--Bruce, Monday, 8:30-9:30	________	________	________	________
2. Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part I--McCullough, Monday, 10:00-11:30	________	________	________	________
3. Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part II--Reynolds, Monday, 12:30-1:30	________	________	________	________
4. Film: Portrait of a Disadvantaged Child: Tommy Knight--Reynolds, Monday, 1:45-2:15	________	________	________	________
5. Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Part III--McCullough, Monday, 2:15-3:00	________	________	________	________
6. Teacher Expectancy--Palardy, Tuesday, 8:30-9:45	________	________	________	________
7. Use of Media in Teaching the Disadvantaged--Selwa, Tuesday, 10:15-11:30	________	________	________	________
8. Literature Concerning the Disadvantaged--Jefferson, Tuesday, 12:30-1:00	________	________	________	________

	of much value to me	of some value to me	of little value to me	I was not present
9. Critical Moments in Teaching--Staff, Tuesday, 1:00-1:45	________	________	________	________
10. Interaction Analysis (IA), Part I--McCullough, Tuesday, 2:00-3:00	________	________	________	________
11. Interaction Analysis (IA), Part II--McCullough, Wednesday, 8:30-9:45	________	________	________	________
12 Interaction Analysis (IA), Part III--McCullough, Wednesday, 10:15-11:30	________	________	________	________
13. Consideration of Problem Focus on the Coming Year--Bruce & Staff, Wednesday, 12:30-1:45	________	________	________	________
14. Critical Moments in Teaching--Staff, Wednesday, 2:00-3:00	________	________	________	________
15. Teaching Strategies--Jefferson, Thursday, 8:30-9:45	________	________	________	________
16. Importance of the Self-Concept--Palardy, Thursday, 10:15-11:30	________	________	________	________
17. Current Curriculum Developments for Disadvantaged--Reynolds & Bruce, Thursday, 12:30-1:45	________	________	________	________
18. Critical Moments in Teaching--McCullough & Selwa, Thursday, 2:00-3:00	________	________	________	________
19. Educational Objectives and Evaluation--Bruce, Friday, 8:30-9:30	________	________	________	________

	of much value to me	of some value to me	of little value to me	I was not present
20. Consideration of Problem Focus for the Coming Year--Staff, Friday, 9:45-10:45				
21. Staff Panel and Conclusion--Staff, Friday, 11:00-12:00				

What were the most valuable experiences of the week?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

What activities should be kept in the conference but improved? How should each of that you named be improved?

What activities should be eliminated from the conference program?

On the reverse side please give us any additional advice you care to.

Thank you-------The Staff

INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

SUMMER 1969

My school system ____

My name ____

During the coming school year I would like to see the teachers from our school system concentrate on one of the following four problems related to the improvement of the instructional program. I have listed first the one I feel is in most urgent need of attention.

1.

2.

3.

4.

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION SUMMARY -- by Counties

Dodge County--------Improving the self-concepts of pupils

Greene County--------Understanding and helping the underachieving student

Macon County---------Increasing the involvement in high school social studies classes

Monroe County--------Effecting a positive change among students in the area of self-concept development

Pike County----------Developing improved techniques for working with disadvantaged through self-evaluation

Schley County--------Improving teacher attitude toward disadvantaged students

Sumter County--------Increasing the vocabulary of disadvantaged children

Twiggs County--------Developing instructional techniques and improvements in the curriculum that will aid in the decrease of pupil failure and an increase in attendance.

Washington County----Evaluating teacher attitudes and behavior.
(and Johnson County)

GREENE COUNTY

SEMINAR SCHEDULE

Meeting place: Conference Room in the rear of the new County Office Building (Old High School Gymnasium)

Time: 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Problem area: Understanding and helping the underachieving student

Schedule:

1. Thursday, September 18
2. Thursday, October 2
3. Thursday, October 16
4. Thursday, October 30
5. Thursday, November 13
6. Thrusday, November 20
7. Thursday, December 11
8. Thursday, January 8
9. Thursday, January 15
10. Thursday, January 22
11. Thursday, February 5
12. Thursday, February 19
13. Thursday, March 12
14. Thursday, April 2
15. Thursday, April 16
16. Thursday, April 30
17. Thursday, May 14
18. Thursday, May 28

SCHLEY COUNTY

SEMINAR SCHEDULE

Meeting place: Library, John Lewis School

Time: 3:15 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.

Problem area: Improvement of teacher attitude toward disadvantaged students.

Schedule:
1. Tuesday, September 23 (~~10:30~~ 3:15)
2. Wednesday, September 24
3. Wednesday, October 8
4. Thursday, October 9
5. Wednesday, October 22
6. Wednesday, November 5
7. Wednesday, November 19
8. Wednesday, December 3
9. Wednesday, December 17
10. Wednesday, January 14
11. Wednesday, January 28
12. Wednesday, February 11
13. Wednesday, February 25
14. Wednesday, March 25
15. Wednesday, April 8
16. Wednesday, April 22
17. Wednesday, May 6
18. Wednesday, May 20

TWIGGS COUNTY

SEMINAR SCHEDULE

Meeting place: Library, Jeffersonville High School

Time: 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Problem area: Instructional techniques and improvement of the curriculum that will aid in the decrease of pupil failure and an increase in attendance.

Schedule:
1. Tuesday, September 16
2. Tuesday, September 30
3. Tuesday, October 14
4. Tuesday, October 28
5. Tuesday, November 4
6. Tuesday, November 11
7. Tuesday, November 25
8. Tuesday, December 9
9. Tuesday, January 6
10. Tuesday, January 20
11. Tuesday, February 3
12. Tuesday, February 17
13. Tuesday, March 10
14. Tuesday, March 31
15. Tuesday, April 14
16. Tuesday, April 28
17. Tuesday, May 12
18. Tuesday, May 26

WASHINGTON COUNTY

SEMINAR SCHEDULE

Meeting place: Washington County High School, Sandersville,
Mrs. Wheeler's Classroom

Time: 3:50 p.m. - 5:50 p.m.

Problem area: Evaluating teacher attitudes and behavior

Schedule:
1. Wednesday, September 17
2. Wednesday, October 1
3. Monday, October 6
4. Wednesday, October 15
5. Wednesday, October 29
6. Wednesday, November 12
7. Monday, November 24
8. Wednesday, December 10
9. Wednesday, January 7
10. Wednesday, January 21
11. Wednesday, February 4
12. Wednesday, February 18
13. Wednesday, March 11
14. Wednesday, April 1
15. Wednesday, April 15
16. Wednesday, April 29
17. Wednesday, May 13
18. Wednesday, May 27